

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors." (Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXI.—OCTOBER, 1906—No. 124

PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

III.

PIUS VI. had been deeply afflicted by the invasion of the rights and liberties of the Church, of which so many Catholic sovereigns and their ministers, acting under the inspiration of the doctrines of Voltaire and his disciples, had been guilty; but these trials were only the forerunners of the still greater sufferings which were to befall the Church when the same doctrines attained their full development in the French Revolution. That insane revolt against civilization and religion which swept away the historic institutions of France and deluged Europe with blood was not, indeed, the work merely of the philosophers and the Freemasons; many of its causes must be sought for back in the past; but it is certain that the flood of atheistical literature which was poured forth over France by d'Alembert, Diderot, Condorcet and their associates from the club which met at the house of Baron Holbach had as its result the demoralization of the nation by the destruction of all religious belief and of all respect for the authority of the Crown.

In combination with this diffusion of irreligious and scurrilous pamphlets the continually increasing influence exercised by the Freemasons must be taken into account. Owing to their skillful policy of enlisting in their ranks members of the aristocracy, to whom the more subversive doctrines of the sect were not confided, and whose social position might disarm the suspicions of the government, they had multiplied their lodges throughout France and her colonies until

in 1789 they amounted to 689, of which over 150 were in Paris, and the number of persons enrolled was calculated at 500,000.¹ At their head since the end of 1773 was the lodge known as the *Grand Orient* of Paris, the grand master of which was the Duke of Orleans. It was formed by representatives of all the other lodges; it was supported by their contributions; acted as arbiter in the disputes which arose between them and issued every six months a fresh password to its affiliated lodges. Not less important than the *Grand Orient* were the *Club de la Propagande*, an association directed by Condorcet and Sieyès, the object of which was to spread the principles of the Revolution, and the *Comité Régulateur*,² formed by a society known as "*Les Amis des Noirs*," which, under the pretext of taking steps for the abolition of Negro slavery, served as a rallying point for all those who aimed at overthrowing the monarchy, and which reckoned among its members many of the men who played a conspicuous part in the stormy times which followed.

The state of disorder into which the finances of the kingdom had fallen gave the conspirators the opportunity which they sought. The annual deficit had been rising for many years, and when, in 1786, it amounted at last to 120,000,000 of francs [24,000,000 of dollars], and the Parliament of Paris refused to register any more edicts of taxation or to assist the government to contract a loan, de Caloune, the Minister of Finance, advised Louis XVI. to summon an Assembly of Notables, an ancient French institution composed of the most distinguished persons of the kingdom and intended to enlighten the sovereign with its advice in times of danger or distress and diminish his responsibility by sharing it. The persons chosen for that purpose,

¹ Barruel, "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme," Londres, 1797-1798; Vol. II., p. 427: "De ces Loges reproduites partout, multipliées dans les villas, répandues dans les bourgs, jusque dans les villages, le même régime et les ordres du Comité Central, pouvaient au même jour, au même instant, faire sortir tous ces essaims d'adeptes . . . portant subitement partout, tous à la fois, la terreur et le désastre; sachant d'avance les victimes à sacrifier, les châteaux à brûler, les têtes à couper pour le triomphe de l'égalité et de la liberté . . . paralysant tout à la fois, et la justice et la force publique; désorganisant tout, bouleversant tout; et pour s'organiser eux-mêmes dans le nouvel empire, ne faisant que changer les Loges souterraines en Clubs de Jacobins, les adeptes en Municipales; montrant enfin la Révolution irrésistible, consommée, irréparable, dès l'instant où elle paraissait, et avant même qu'on en eût pensé à l'arrêter."

² Barruel, "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme," Londres, 1797-1798, Vol. II., p. 460: "Le Club Régulateur comptait au moins dès-lors (en 1789) sur cinq cents mille Frères, tous pleins d'ardeur pour la Révolution, répandus dans toutes les parties de la France, tous prêts à s'élever au premier signal d'insurrection, et par la violence d'une première impulsion, capables d'entraîner avec eux la plus grande partie du peuple. Les Sophistes dès-lors disaient assez hautement, qu'on ne triomphe pas aisément de trois millions de bras."

to the number of 157, met at Versailles on February 22, 1787, but the only result of their deliberations was to establish free trade in corn; to abolish "*la corvée*," or forced labor on the lands of the nobles and to replace de Caloune by Cardinal de Loménie de Brienne. As the resistance of the Parliament still continued, the King yielded to the demands proceeding from all parts of France for the convocation of *Les États Généraux*, or the States General, which had not met since 1614, and meetings were at once held for the election of 1,200 representatives of the clergy, the nobility and the "*tiers-état*," or the citizens, in which more than two millions of persons took part. It is a remarkable fact that the *Cahiers*, or books of instruction drawn up for the guidance of the Deputies, though demanding many reforms in the existing institutions, manifested in general the attachment of the nation to the Catholic Church and to the family of Bourbon.

The *États Généraux* were opened at Versailles on May 5, 1789, by a speech from the King, in which he alluded to the sacrifices of their ancient privileges which the clergy and the nobility were willing to make for the welfare of their fellow-countrymen; but when, on the following day, the deliberations of the Deputies began, the *Tiers-État*, which was equal in numbers to both the others, and in many of the members of which there was already a spirit of hostility to the Church and to the aristocracy, demanded that the three orders should meet and vote together instead of separately, as had always been the custom. Five weeks were wasted in tedious negotiations on this question, until the *Tiers-État*, acting under the guidance of Mirabeau and of Sieyès, proclaimed itself the sole representative of the nation under the title of *L'Assemblée Nationale Constituante*, and after some slight resistance on the part of the feeble and irresolute Louis XVI., the clergy and the nobility were allowed to join them, although such were not the instructions which the Deputies had received from their electors.

A dangerous state of discontent had long existed among the people of Paris, caused chiefly by the high price of bread, but which the Duke of Orleans and the faction which aspired to raise him to the throne were accused of fomenting. The gardens of his palace, which he had thrown open to the public, were every day the scene of tumultuous popular assemblies, where agitators, assured of impunity owing to his protection, excited the people against the court and sought to drive it to commit acts of violence. It broke out at last into open rebellion. On July 13 the Monastery of St. Lazare, founded by St. Vincent de Paul, was attacked by the mob and plundered and its library of 50,000 volumes destroyed. On the same day 20 pieces of cannon and some thousands of muskets were carried off from the

Hôtel des Invalides. A National Guard was formed, each of the sixty electoral divisions into which Paris was divided furnishing a battalion, and on the following day the Bastille was taken and its Governor and most of its defenders murdered.

An extraordinary panic then seized the entire nation, which can only be ascribed to the secret machinations of the network of revolutionary lodges which covered all France. There appeared suddenly on all the main roads of France messengers bearing the news that bands of brigands were coming to destroy the crops and to plunder the towns.³ The people immediately flew to arms; national guards were formed and committees, which took the place of the local authorities, and the villagers in their mad terror attacked and burned many of the castles of the nobles, the owners of which were in many cases put to death with the utmost cruelty.

Instead of adopting efficacious means for the repression of these disturbances, the Assembly spent its time in metaphysical discussions about the rights of man and in sweeping away one after the other the ancient institutions of France. In the celebrated sitting of the night of the 4th of August, 1789, when most of these reforms were enthusiastically adopted by acclamation and without discussion, the clergy and the nobles not only offered no opposition to the abolition of their privileges, but helped it by their spontaneous sacrifices. It had then been proposed to redeem the tithes, but on August 11 the Archbishop of Paris, speaking in the name of all the clergy, voluntarily consented to their abolition; and in September the same prelate made the sacrifice, for the good of the nation, of all the church plate except what was necessary for the Divine service; but this generosity met with little gratitude from men whose sole aim was to ruin and, if possible, to destroy the Church, for on October 10 Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, a prelate who had adopted the ideas of the philosophers, proposed that the nation should take possession of all the property of the Church and pay the members of the clergy pensions by way of compensation. This suggestion was supported by Mirabeau, and after a long and violent discussion the Assembly, which was surrounded by bands of armed men for the purpose of intimidating those who defended the cause of the Church, ratified it by a decree on November 2, and this was followed by another on December 19, which

³ François Pages, "Histoire Secrète de la Révolution Française, depuis la convocation des notables jusqu'à ce jour (11er Nov., 1796)," A Paris, An V. (1797), t. I., p. 171: "On bruit général se répand dans tout le royaume à la fois, et avec la rapidité de l'éclair, que les princes fugitifs se proposent d'attaquer la France; on ajoute que des milliers de brigands vont arriver . . . qu'il n'y a pas un moment à perdre pour se mettre en défense . . . Suivant quelques-uns, ces bruits furent répandus par le conseil de Mirabeau . . . D'autres attribuent cette idée . . . à la faction d'Orléans."

ordered the immediate sale of church property to the amount of 400,000,000 of livres [80,000,000 of dollars].

But it was not enough to deprive the secular clergy of independence and reduce them to the position of paid functionaries of a State Church, as a preliminary to that total abolition of all religion which the disciples of Voltaire aimed at, but could only hope to attain by degrees; the existence of the monastic orders and their close connection with Rome would have rendered such an institution impossible, and their suppression was accordingly decided on February 13, 1790, when it was enacted that all orders and congregations of men were thenceforth to cease to exist, and that the religious who wished to return to the world should be freed from their vows. Certain houses, however, were to be reserved for those who preferred to remain in their order. The congregations employed in teaching or in caring for the sick were to be provisionally spared, and the nuns were still to be allowed to reside in their convents. It was in vain that many of the Bishops, that the monastic orders and the Catholics of almost every province protested against these decrees. No heed was given to their remonstrances by an Assembly in which the hatred of the Church predominated over every other sentiment, and which took hardly any notice of the disturbances in the south of France, where the exasperation caused by the seizure and the plunder of the churches brought on a state of civil war, with the result that at Nîmes in June, 1790, over 300 Catholics were massacred by bands of Protestants from the mountains of the Cevennes.

The Assembly then proceeded to introduce a measure which had been drawn up by its ecclesiastical committee, most of the members of which were Jansenists and were very probably glad to have at last the opportunity of abolishing the authority of the Pope in France and establishing a schismatical church. In the early part of the century the Jansenists had assisted the Voltairians to destroy the Jesuits, and this was the last service they were destined to render them before being swept away themselves by the Revolution.

This law was known as *la Constitution Civile du Clergé*, and it was the cause of the most ruthless and sanguinary persecution which has afflicted the Church since the days of the Roman Emperors. It began by suppressing the 135 sees then existing in France, and enacted that each of the newly created 83 departments should form a diocese, and these were to be grouped in ten metropolitan *arrondissements* or circuits. The boundaries of all the parishes were also to be reconstructed, some being suppressed and other enlarged; and wherever a portion of the diocese of a foreign Bishop extended across the frontier into France, it was to be incorporated with a French diocese and the authority of the foreign prelate rejected. All chapters of

canons, chaplaincies, prebends were to be abolished; the Bishop was to be the parish priest of his cathedral; the other priests of the same church his curates, and they, along with the superiors and the directors of the diocesan seminary, were to form a council, without whose advice the Bishop could not exercise any jurisdiction. Both the Bishops and the parish priests were to be elected by the people, the former by the electors who were qualified to vote for the nomination of the administrators of the department, the latter by those who voted for the choice of the administrators of the districts, and all of whom might be Protestants, Jews or atheists.

The election was to take place on a Sunday; in the principal church of the capital of the department, if it was for a Bishop; or of the chief town of the district if it was for a parish priest, and after the Parochial Mass, at which the electors were bound to assist. The result of the elections was to be announced in the same church, also on a Sunday, in presence of the people and of the clergy, by the president of the electoral assembly, and to be followed by the celebration of Mass. The Bishop thus elected was to be consecrated by the metropolitan of that *arrondissement*, or if he refused to do so, by the senior Bishop; and he was not to apply to the Sovereign Pontiff for the confirmation of his election, but merely to write to him as to the head of the Universal Church to inform him of the fact and as a testimony of his desire to remain in communion with him. The parish priests were to receive their canonical institution from their Bishop, and if he refused it, they could apply to the civil court of their district, which would decide the question. Before, however, either the Bishop or the priests could exercise their functions they had to swear to be faithful to the nation, the law and the King and to uphold the constitution decreed by the Assembly and accepted by the King. The law fixed also the salaries of the clergy, assigning 50,000 *livres* (10,000 dollars) to the Bishop of Paris and from 20,000 to 12,000 to the others, while the parish priests received from 6,000 to 1,200 in Paris and from 2,400 to 700 in the country.

Pius VI. had until then kept silence lest any remonstrances on his part should irritate the revolutionists and provoke them to commit still greater crimes; but while this law was being discussed Louis XVI., foreseeing the dangers with which it menaced the Church, asked him whether, in view of the difficult situation in which he was placed, he might not make some concessions to the will of the Assembly and accept the law, at least provisionally. The answer of the Holy Father left no excuse for indecision on the matter. He warned the King that by his approbation of the law he would run the risk of leading his kingdom into a schism or a religious war, and that though he was free to renounce his royal prerogatives, he had not the

right to abandon what was due to God and to the Church. He advised him, therefore, to consult the prelates who were in his council, Mgr. Lefranc de Pompignan, Archbishop of Vienne, and Mgr. de Cicé, Archbishop of Bordeaux, as well as the other Bishops of France, and be guided by their decision.⁴ In spite, however, of this warning the irresolute and pusillanimous monarch, without waiting for the opinion of a congregation of Cardinals which had been specially summoned by Pius VI. to examine the question, and with the concurrence of at least Mgr. de Cicé, the keeper of the seals, yielded to the threats of the Assembly and signed the *Constitution Civile* on August 24, 1790.

It remained inoperative for some time, as no vacancy among the higher clergy or the parish priests, which would have necessitated its application, occurred just then, and the Bishops continued to exercise their functions without heeding its regulations; but in their pastoral letters they enlightened their flocks as to its errors. Those who sat in the Assembly published a protest in which they pointed out the incompetency of the civil power to legislate on questions of ecclesiastical discipline, and with the exception of Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Sens; of Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun; of de Savine, Bishop of Viviers; of de Jarente, Bishop of Orleans, and of Gobel, Bishop of Lydda (*in partibus infidelium*), a suffragan of the Diocese of Bâle, all the prelates of France and seven foreign Bishops whose sees extended into France announced their adhesion to this declaration.

As, therefore, in the ordinary course of events many years might

⁴ Rev. Augustin Theiner, "Documents relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France, 1790 à 1800; extraits des Archives secrètes du Vatican," Paris, 1857-1858, Vol. I., p. 1. S. D. N. Pii Divina Providentia Papæ VI. Allocutio habita in Consistorio secreto die 29 Martii 1790. "Actum illic primo fuit de publica œconomia ordinanda, cumque ea dirigenda esset ad populorum levanda onera, ad nostras apostolici ministerii curas nequaquam pertinere videbatur. Sed . . . gradus repente factus est ad religionem ipsam, tanquam politicis negotiis subjici ac inservire deberet . . . Per decreta, quæ a generalibus nationis comitiis prodierunt, ipsa impetitur, perturbaturque religio; hujus apostolicæ sedis usurpantur jura; solemnia pacta et conventa violantur . . . Videmus profecto, quam grave Nobis impositum sit loquendi, monendi, hortandique munus; sed novimus etiam non solum inanem futuram vocem nostram, quod uteremur, ad efferatam populi in omnem licentiam effusi multitudinem, qua proruit ad incendia, ad rapinas, ad supplicia, interfectionesque civium, neque ullum reliquit humanitati locum; verum etiam verendum esse, ne magis magisque ad alia facinora irritetur et accendatur. . . . Interea hanc nostram allocutionem, ut testem, adhibendam duximus, quod agnoscamus scilicet, quanta inferatur injuria religioni, quantum ab hujus apostolica sedis juribus detrapatur, unaque declaramus taciturnitatem nostram non ad incuriam, multo minus ad approbationem esse referendam, at necessarium esse pro hoc tempore silentium, donec per alias rerum vicissitudines, quas Deo protegente proximas propitiasque speramus, utiliter loqui possimus."

elapse before the Church of France could be brought under the rule of the *Constitution Civile*, it became necessary to amend the law so as to render it immediately efficacious, and although among the "Rights of Man," which had been so recently discussed and proclaimed, was that of "religious liberty," according to which every citizen was to be free to profess whatever form of worship he pleased, the Assembly now sought to impose on France a religion which it had just constructed, in which the majority of its members, who were Voltairians, did not believe, and which had been rejected almost unanimously by the Bishops of France. Another law was therefore presented to the Assembly on November 26, which enacted that the Bishops and parish priests whose sees and parishes had not been suppressed by the recent reorganization, their curates as well as the superiors of the seminaries, who were all considered as functionaries of the State and to whom a little later were added the chaplains of public establishments, should take the oath to the *Constitution Civile* under pain of being prosecuted as rebels against the law, deprived of their salaries and of their rights as citizens and replaced in their dignities by others who would be more submissive. Moreover, all ecclesiastics or laymen who should combine to refuse to obey the decrees voted by the Assembly and accepted by the King should be severely punished as disturbers of the public tranquillity. The intolerance of the majority in the Assembly hardly allowed this law to be discussed; it was voted on November 27, and on December 26, 1790, the unfortunate Louis XVI., terrorized by a popular demonstration under his windows and made to believe that his refusal might be the cause of a massacre of the clergy, yielded after a long resistance and signed it.

Thenceforth every Bishop or priest who refused to take the oath to this schismatic organization, and every layman who assisted at their Mass or received the sacraments from them, was liable to be considered as an enemy of the State and to be prosecuted for rebellion against its authority; but to the honor of the French Church it can be said that all the prelates, with the exception of the four already named, and by far the great majority of the secular and regular clergy preferred to undergo exile and death rather than consent to take the oath.

As for those who consented, it must be observed that great uncertainty prevailed for some time with regard to the views of the Holy Father, and false reports were spread that he did not intend to interfere in the affairs of France; for the two Archbishops who sat in the King's Council had not published the letter which he had received from Pius VI., as they still hoped to make some compromise with the Assembly. Many also took the oath conditionally and with the re-

striction that it should not apply to anything contrary to ecclesiastical discipline. The Assembly then sought to form a hierarchy for this official Church. After some hesitation Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, consented to give his services, and on February 24, 1791, assisted by Gobel and Mirondet, the Bishops *in partibus* of Lydda and Babylon, he consecrated at the Church of the Oratory in Paris two priests, Expilly and Marolles, as Bishops of Guimper and Soissons. Other consecrations speedily followed, the movement being largely aided by the Jacobin clubs of each locality,⁵ who selected as candidates those members of the clergy who had most distinguished themselves by their advocacy of the principles of the Revolution, and in a few months all the newly created sees were occupied. One hundred and twenty of these schismatic prelates were elected and consecrated between 1791 and 1801, when the *Constitution Civile* was officially abolished.

A Papal brief appeared at last on March 10, 1791, addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops who sat in the Assembly. Though it did not as yet pass any definite sentence on the law, it blamed severely the pretension of the Assembly to legislate in matters belonging to the discipline of the Church and requested the hierarchy to express their opinions on the subject. This was followed on April 13 by a brief to all the clergy and the faithful of France in which the *Constitution Civile* was formally condemned as heretical in many parts, in others schismatic and contrary to the laws of the Church and having no other object than the destruction of the Catholic religion. The elections which had taken place to episcopal sees or to parish churches were declared to be unlawful and null, the consecrations of Bishops sacrilegious; all those who had any share in them were suspended from every ecclesiastical function, and those who had taken the oath were ordered to retract it within forty days under pain of suspension in case of noncompliance.

⁵ The Jacobins derived their origin from "Le Club Breton," or "Société des Amis de la Constitution," founded at Versailles in 1789 by the Deputies of the Tiers Etat from Brittany to the Etats Généraux. Other Deputies also joined them, such as the Duc d'Orléans, Talleyrand, Miraband, Sieyès, Pétion, Robespierre. When the Assembly removed to Paris, the club hired as a meeting place the refectory of the Dominican monks in the Rue St. Honoré, who were known as "les Jacobins," because their first convent in Paris had been founded in 1217 near the Porte Saint Jacques. They were at first constitutional and monarchical, and represented the liberal middle class, but expelled the moderate members after August 10, 1792, and became republican, taking after September 21, 1792, when royalty was abolished, the name of "Société des Jacobins, amis de la liberté et de l'égalité." They formed innumerable affiliated societies over all France to spread the ideas of the Revolution, and by their organization and discipline, their fanaticism and intolerance they became the moving power in the State and imposed their will on the Assemblies which governed France.

As soon as the condemnation of the *Constitution Civile* by the Sovereign Pontiff became known large numbers of the clergy who through fear or ignorance had complied with the law and taken the oath hastened to retract their error, and before long there remained among the schismatics only the least recommendable members of the French Church—priests who had been previously interdicted, unfrocked monks who had been the disgrace of their order and men who had been dismissed from the seminaries as incapable, but whom the intruding Bishops did not scruple to ordain. On the other hand, many ecclesiastics who until then had led frivolous and worldly lives were recalled to a sense of their duty in presence of the dangers which menaced the Church, and they underwent the persecution which ensued with dignity and courage.

On the part of the laity, the adhesions to the Constitutional Church were mostly confined to the citizens of the towns and large villages where Voltairian doctrines had been long disseminated and where the Jacobin clubs affiliated to that of Paris; the National Guard, which after the fall of the Bastille had been formed out of the more turbulent elements of the populace, and the municipal officials, among whom the Jacobins predominated, were always ready to seize on any pretext for molesting the clergy. The peasantry, however, generally remained faithful to their legitimate pastors. They abandoned the parish churches where the clergy appointed by the State had been installed, in most cases forcibly and only with the assistance of troops, and they assembled to assist at the Masses said by non-juring priests in monastic houses or, as in Brittany, at night in the depths of the forests. It was also still possible for the Catholics living in towns to hear Mass and frequent the sacraments in the oratories of the religious orders of women, which had not as yet been suppressed, for they steadfastly refused to acknowledge the authority of the schismatic Bishops, and their chaplains were not as yet bound to take the oath. The fury of the people was therefore stirred up against them in the great cities. In Paris a crowd of men and women collected from the dregs of the populace broke into several of the convents on April 8, 1791, not sparing even those of the Sisters of Charity, and flogged the nuns with the utmost brutality, while no attempt was made on the part of the authorities to take their defense, and though on the following day the municipality published a proclamation reproving those who had been guilty of this crime, it took care to throw the blame upon the nuns, accusing them of having provoked it by their refusal to accept the constitution, and it ordered their churches to be thenceforth closed to the public. The same outrage was shortly after repeated at Nantes, Rennes, Bordeaux and other provincial towns, where both the nuns and many ladies

who had come to hear Mass were the victims of the ferocity of the rioters.

These cowardly aggressions, however, produced a feeling of shame even among the Voltairians then in power, and by a decree (May 7, 1791) of the Directory of the Department of the Seine, which was ratified by the Assembly, the Catholics were allowed to hire the churches which had been taken from them and closed and have Mass said by priests who had refused to take the oath; but these churches were to bear an inscription to distinguish them from those of the State, and it was strictly forbidden to make any manifestation there against the laws or the authorities, that is to say, to preach against the *Constitution Civile* or the schismatic clergy.

The slight relief granted to the Catholics by this decree was soon withdrawn from them in Paris by the violence of the mob which continued to insult and ill treat those who ventured to assist at Mass, and in the provinces by the action of the local authorities, who in many places were terrorized by the Jacobin clubs. Under their influence the administrators of the departments and of the districts frequently exceeded their powers and went much further than the Assembly had intended. They even deprived of all civic rights those who refused to take part in the elections of Bishops and parish priests, for they accused them of combining to disobey the law, and they therefore denied them the right to vote at any other election or to exercise any public function. They also condemned those priests who had refused to take the oath or who had retracted it to reside far from their parishes, and an open persecution of the clergy soon existed throughout France. Thus in the department of the Côtes-du-Nord, by a decree of June 18, 1791, every unsworn priest was obliged to leave his parish and go to live at a distance of six leagues from it as soon as his officially named successor arrived; and any priest who administered the sacraments was condemned to six years in prison and those who received them to six months. In the departments of Illa-et-Vilaine and Finistère the clergy who refused the oath were sent to reside at four leagues from their parishes, but in those of Morbihan, Mayenne, Cloire Inférieure and many others they were seized in their dwellings at night and, to the number of several hundreds, brought by the National Guards to the chief town of the departments to be there imprisoned.

The dissolution of the *Assemblée Constituante* on September 3, 1791, and the amnesty granted on that occasion for all political offenses set free the clergy who had been arrested or banished and gave the Church a short respite from persecution, but without any guarantee for the future, and as the members of the *Constituante* could not be reëlected, the *Assemblée Législative*, which succeeded

it on October 1, was composed in a large measure of functionaries who had already persecuted the Catholics in their respective districts and were inclined to be still more hostile to the Church than their predecessors. The new Assembly showed the spirit which animated it by issuing a decree on November 29 which made a slight change in the oath of the *Constitution Civile*, but which did not change its schismatic character, and deprived those priests who refused to take it of the right to exercise any civil or religious functions, condemning them also to banishment if they could be accused of causing any disturbance, and to imprisonment if they remained in the country. Louis XVI. refused to sanction this decree, but it was immediately enforced with the utmost rigor in no less than forty-two departments, and in the state of anarchy which prevailed throughout France, especially in the south, the National Guards and the Jacobin clubs in many localities burned the castles of the aristocracy and plundered the houses of the smaller landowners who were accused of being hostile to the Revolution without any effort being made to repress them.

Some congregations had been tolerated until then—the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, the Oratorians, the Seminary of St. Sulpice and of St. Lazare as well as most of the religious orders of women. But by the law of May 2, 1792, they were suppressed and their property sold; and thus were swept away the treasures of art and monuments of antiquity accumulated in the course of centuries in their monasteries and churches. A small pension was promised to the members of these orders, but only on condition of taking an oath to be faithful to the nation and to support liberty and equality or to die in defending them. Some orders which cared for the sick in the hospitals were provisionally spared, but the wearing of the dress of the secular or regular clergy was prohibited. A still more drastic law, described as a measure for the public safety, was enacted on May 27, namely, that every priest who had not taken the oath or who had retracted after having taken it should be expelled from the country if a request to that effect were made by twenty citizens; but for those who could be accused of having caused any disturbance the demand of one citizen would suffice; and in case of their return to France the penalty would be ten years in prison. As it was in the power of any Jacobin club to make the celebration of Mass or the administration of the sacraments a pretext for a noisy demonstration, it would not be difficult under this law to put a stop to all public worship. The fact that Louis XVI. refused his signature to this decree did not prevent it from being put into execution, and it was rendered obligatory after the attack on the palace of the Tuileries on August 10, 1792, when the faithful Swiss Guards were massacred

at their posts; and the King, who had taken refuge in the Assembly, was deprived by it of his authority and imprisoned in the temple together with the other members of the royal family.

At the same date a rising of the populace established the *Commune*, that revolutionary municipality of Paris which played such an important part in subsequent events and was responsible for most of the bloodshed and of the hideous crimes of that epoch. It was composed of 192 commissioners chosen from among the most fanatical Jacobins by the 48 sections into which the city was divided; it was led by Marat and Robespierre and countenanced by Danton, who was Minister of Justice, and it imposed its will by terrorism not only on the Assembly, but also on all France. Thenceforward the decrees against the clergy followed each other still more rapidly than before. On August 13 the wearing of the clerical dress was again prohibited; on the 14th all the bronze monuments in the churches were ordered to be melted down for cannon, and all the sacred vessels of gold and silver still remaining in the sacristies were sent to the Mint; and another, aimed not only at those priests who had not yet been expelled from their parishes, but also at the schismatical clergy, imposed on all persons who received any salary from the State the same oaths of fidelity to the nation that had been demanded from the monks and nuns who had been pensioned off.

The law of May 27, severe as it was, does not seem to have given satisfactory results or to have been found sufficiently swift in its action, for on August 28, by a still more arbitrary decree, the Assembly enacted that all priests who, being bound to take the oath, refused to do so, or who, having taken it, had retracted, should leave France within fifteen days, and if they refused to comply, they were to be sent to Guyana. Any priest who returned from exile should be condemned to ten years in prison, and those who, though not bound to take the oath, should perform any act of public worship might be deported by the local authorities on being denounced by six citizens; those who were too infirm to be deported were to be assembled in the chief town of the department under the supervision of the municipality.

These decrees gave a fresh impulse to the persecution and excited still more the fury of the Jacobins against the clergy, for though in some cases the priests who were thus forced to abandon their country were given their passports quickly and allowed to depart, they had generally to undergo many insults from the officials of the municipalities or of the districts before they could obtain them. Many were also arrested while on their way by the National Guards, searched and plundered of the little they carried with them, then chained two by two and led to the frontier by soldiers, only too happy

to escape with their lives from the brutality of the rabble of the towns through which they passed.

But it was in Paris that the slaughter of those members of the clergy who had refused the schismatical oath was carried out on the largest scale. There, after the storming of the Tuileries, the *Commune* had imprisoned in the Convent of the Discalced Carmelites, in the rue de Vangirard, over two hundred ecclesiastics, almost all men distinguished by their learning and their piety, amongst whom were the Archbishops of Arles, the Bishops of Beauvais and of Saintes, the professors of the Seminary of St. Sulpice and the aged and infirm priests who resided in the house of St. Francis de Sales, and on September 2, with the exception of a few who succeeded in escaping or who were rescued by some courageous citizens, they were murdered by hired assassins. Thirty others were killed in the cloisters of St. Germain des Près, sixty in the neighboring prison of l'Abbaye and seventy-nine out of the ninety-six who were confined in the Seminary of St. Firmin.⁶ All these victims might have saved their lives if they had consented to take the oath to the *Constitution Civile* or even to declare that they had. Then, under the pretext of wishing to save the republic from its enemies who were said to be about to betray Paris to the allied armies on the frontiers, or impelled by an insane mania for bloodshed, the same bands of assassins attacked the other prisons, where besides the ordinary criminals between 3,000 and 5,000 persons were detained who had been arrested on suspicion during the domiciliary visits which the *Commune* had ordered to be made in every house in Paris on the 29th and 30th of August, and slaughtered the greater number of the prisoners. These massacres lasted until September 6; many women and children perished in them, and altogether, according to the official return, which is probably very much less than the truth, 1,458 persons, though some historians bring the number up to 12,000. Many provincial towns followed the example of Paris, and the Jacobin mob showed the same sanguinary instincts. At Meaux seven priests were murdered; at Rheims, six; at Lyons, eight officers and two priests, and at Versailles, a convoy of forty-four prisoners coming from Orléans, among whom were the Bishop of Mendes and nine priests.

The Legislative Assembly whose cowardly connivance had allowed the *Commune* of Paris and the Jacobin clubs to perpetrate such crimes with impunity ended its existence on September 21, 1792, after having on the previous day passed a law to sanction divorce. Its successor, the Convention, whose creation had been decided on

⁶ Abbé J. N. Jager, "Histoire de l'Eglise de France pendant la Révolution," Paris, 1852, t. III., p. 522: "Suivant un compte rendu le 27 Novembre, 1792, le Comité de surveillance avait dépensé 84,664 livres (about \$16,932) pour les journées de Septembre" (Archives de la Préfecture de Police).

August 10, was still more frankly revolutionary, for although the more moderate party had obtained a strong majority in the provinces in spite of the efforts of the Jacobins to intimidate the electors, in Paris, the victory of the clubs was complete, and as 491 of the 750 members of the Convention were new to Parliamentary life, and a large number were incompetent and irresolute, they were easily dominated and guided by the ardent and unscrupulous minority. But though the Jacobin party in the Convention, known as *la Montagne*, was bitterly hostile to *les Girondins*, or Moderates, whom they ultimately sent to the scaffold, both factions always united to make war on the Church and to persecute the clergy.

The anti-Christian fanaticism of the Convention became still more violent after the execution of Louis XVI. on January 21, 1793, for by the law of March 10 it was decreed that every citizen was bound to denounce within eight days the returned emigrants and the priests liable to deportation, and that all such who should be arrested should be tried by a military tribunal and shot within twenty-four hours. There were, however, many priests who had not as yet been required to take the oath to the *Constitution Civile*, such as the members of chapters and of religious orders, though some of them had thought it allowable to take that of fidelity to the nation; but on April 23 another law prescribed that ecclesiastics, both secular and regular, who should refuse to take that oath should be at once deported to Guyana, as well as those whom six citizens should denounce as guilty of *incivisme*. At once in all parts of France the priests who could not succeed in evading the local authorities were arrested and brought to the western seaports to be embarked. Those who were sent to Rochefort were thrust into two vessels which had been employed as slavers, the *Washington* and *les Deux Associés*, but the vigilance of the English fleet prevented them from sailing for America. There for nearly two years, until the beginning of February, 1795, they underwent incredible sufferings. By day they were exposed without shelter to the burning heat of summer and to the inclemency of winter; at night they were crowded together in a narrow space between decks; their clothes were not replaced when they fell into rags; their food was repulsive; they were devoured by vermin and the sailors and officers took pleasure in insulting them in the coarsest language. It is not surprising that out of 827 ecclesiastics sent to Rochefort, only 285 survived these prolonged tortures. At Bordeaux and in the neighboring citadel of Blaye at least 900 priests were imprisoned and underwent nearly the same sufferings until three months after the fall of Robespierre, at which time 250 had already perished. The survivors were then embarked on three vessels for deportation, but were finally set free in the course of the years 1795 and 1796.

It would be impossible to enter into the details of the merciless persecution which in the meanwhile had been excited throughout France by the representatives of the people whom the Convention, at the instigation of the Jacobins, sent two by two into each department to insure the triumph of the Revolution. Invested with absolute power, they raised the guillotine in every city and executed without distinction of age or sex or social rank whoever was suspected of hostility to the republic or of fidelity to the faith of their fathers. Every department of France was drenched with blood; the priests, who hid in the forests and the mountains, were hunted like wild beasts; those who concealed a priest if discovered were punished with death;⁷ the Catholics who refused to assist at a Mass said by one of the clergy who had accepted the *Constitution Civile* were imprisoned. Wherever resistance was offered and a town rose against this tyranny, as at Lyons and Toulon, the victims were to be reckoned by hundreds, and the sentences of the military tribunals were carried out by grape shot as being more expeditious than the guillotine. This was especially the case in *la Vendée*, where the heroic peasantry, fighting for their faith and their King, after inflicting many defeats on the troops of the Convention, were crushed at last by superior numbers and by the *colonnes infernales*, which laid the country waste with fire and sword, and in their blind fury did not spare even the partisans of the Revolution, but massacred indiscriminately all whom they met.

The Convention continued to render its legislation against the clergy still more relentless so as to leave its victims no outlet for escape. Thus the law of October 20, 1793, whilst consolidating some of those which preceded, decreed that all priests liable to be deported, that is, who had not taken the oath to the *Constitution Civile*, or who had retracted, were to be shot within twenty-four hours if found on the frontiers, while carrying passports from the leaders of the *émigrés*,⁸ or "counter-revolutionary emblems," that is to say, crucifixes, rosaries or breviaries; or if arrested in the interior of France after returning from emigration or deportation. The testimony of two witnesses would suffice to prove the liability to deportation, and any one who should conceal a priest coming within the scope of the law should

⁷ Picot, "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le XVIII. e Siècle," Paris, 1856, t. VI., p. 295: "On a compté 117 personnes condamnées par divers tribunaux, pour avoir caché ou assisté des prêtres insermentés."

⁸ The *émigrés*, or emigrants, were the nobles and other persons hostile to the Revolution who fled from France to take refuge in foreign countries. The emigration began after the taking of the Bastille (July 14, 1789) by the departure of the King's brother, the Comte d'Artois, the Prince de Condé, the Duc de Bourbon, followed by many nobles. They always entertained the hope of returning and of restoring the monarchy.

undergo the same punishment. By the same decree any priest who had taken the oath to the *Constitution Civile* and who, on the denunciation of six citizens, might be found guilty of "*incivisme*," a very vague term which could be made to include any act or expression of opinion opposed to the principles of the Revolution, was to be immediately deported. This clause placed the schismatic Church still more under the authority of the State and confirmed another decree which had been voted on June 19 and which sentenced to deportation any Bishop or priest who should offer any opposition, directly or indirectly, to the marriage of a priest. For many of the suspended priests and of the unfrocked monks from among whom the hierarchy and the clergy of this Jansenist institution had been recruited had married; their conduct had been highly approved of by the Convention, and it was resolved to treat opposition to the marriage of priests or of divorced persons as "*incivisme*."

The introduction of the Republican Calendar on October 25 was another step towards the abolition of Christianity, for by the division of the months into decades instead of weeks, and the substitution of the names of plants, animals and agricultural instruments for those of saints, it was hoped that the observation of Sunday would be rendered impossible; that the feasts of the Church would be soon forgotten, and that thus all trace of religion would be obliterated from the minds of the people. One of the chief duties of the representatives sent into the departments as missionaries of the Revolution was to insist on the acceptance of this calendar, and the number and violence of the decrees which they issued on the subject in every part of France is a proof of the tenacity with which the people, and especially the peasantry, clung to their faith in spite of the terrorism exercised by the Jacobins.

It did not, however, seem to the *Commune* of Paris that the Convention was progressing rapidly enough or showing sufficient enterprise in its warfare against Christianity; it therefore persuaded Gobel, the constitutional Bishop of Paris, to take part in a scandalous demonstration which it hoped would impel the Convention to take still more decisive measures. It took place on the 17th Brumaire, an II. (7th November, 1793), when Gobel, preceded by Pache, the Mayor of Paris; Chaumette, the procurator of the *Commune*, and other functionaries, and accompanied by several of his clergy, appeared before the Convention wearing the red cap and carrying in his hand his mitre, his crozier and his ring. These he laid down in presence of the Assembly and declared that he and his curates renounced their ecclesiastical functions, gave up their ordination letters (*letters de prêtrise*), and that thenceforth the national religion should be simply the worship of liberty and equality. Many other members

of the constitutional clergy in various parts of France imitated this act of apostasy by sending in their letters of ordination to the Convention, but it is only just to observe that when a little later it came to the turn of the constitutional clergy to be accused of *incivisme* and to furnish victims for the scaffold the greater part of them, and among others Gobel himself, retracted their schismatical oaths, abjured their errors and died repentant.

This manifestation was followed by the sacrilegious profanation of the Cathedral of Notre Dame, which the *Commune* had declared should thenceforth be known as the Temple of Reason. There, on the 20th Brumaire an II. (10th November, 1793), a mountain had been raised framed in by curtains so as to separate it from the choir of the church; it bore on its side the altar of Reason, and was crowned by a temple dedicated to Philosophy, whence issued the Goddess of Liberty, represented by the wife of a member of the *Commune* clad in white robes and a blue mantle, with the red Phrygian cap on her head and bearing in her hand a pike, and took her seat on a throne while a hymn was sung in her honor. A procession was then formed and the assistants carried their living idol to receive the homage of the Convention, whence the Deputies were led back by the people to the Cathedral to assist at a repetition of the impious ceremony. A few days later the *Commune* closed the few churches which still remained open in Paris and decreed that whoever should ask to reopen a church should be arrested as suspect.

Robespierre, whose influence then predominated in the Convention and in the committee of public safety and who hoped to become the recognized head of the State, was jealous of the growing power of the *Commune*, which threatened to supersede the Convention and guide the course of events. He therefore violently attacked its atheistical demonstrations, which he saw would render the Revolution odious and ridiculous in the eyes of the other nations. His denunciation sent the principal members of the *Commune* to the scaffold, accused of being traitors to their country and paid agents of the foreigner, and he then proposed to the Convention to establish a vague Deism under the name of *le culte de l'Être Suprême*. The Convention accepted his suggestion by a decree on the 18th Floréal an II. (7th May, 1794), and the feast was celebrated for the first time on the 20th Prairial (8th June). A colossal statue of Atheism had been erected in the garden of the Tuileries, and Robespierre, who had been elected president of the Convention for the occasion, after pronouncing a speech filled with the usual platitudes about the vices of tyrants and the virtues of republicans, set fire to it with a torch, when it disappeared in flames and in its place was seen a statue of Wisdom rather blackened with smoke. The spectators then went in

procession to the *Champ de Mars*, Robespierre walking ostentatiously much in advance of his colleagues. There a mountain had been constructed, on the summit of which the members of the Convention took their places, while the slopes were covered with musicians and singers and the people were grouped round the base. Hymns were then sung, martial airs performed, an oath was sworn by all present never to disarm until the enemies of the republic had been annihilated and the ceremony was ended by discharges of artillery.

But the Convention had grown weary of the arrogance, the despotism and the bloodthirstiness of Robespierre. There were then 400,000 persons in the prisons of France. The procedure of the Revolutionary tribunal had been rendered still more summary than before. It was sending victims to the guillotine at the rate of sixty a day, and every member of the Convention trembled for his life. The end came unexpectedly. While submitting to the Convention still more sanguinary measures, by which he hoped to rid himself of his enemies, Robespierre was suddenly accused of being a tyrant and a dictator. His efforts to defend himself were not listened to, and he took refuge among his partisans at the Hotel de Ville; but an attempt to excite an insurrection in his favor failed, and he was guillotined on the following day. But though what is known as the "Reign of Terror" then came to an end, the cessation of these massacres brought little relief to the Catholic Church. It is true that many aged and infirm priests were released, and that those who had survived their detention at Rochefort were brought to Saintes in February, 1795, and set free after a few months; but those who returned from emigration were still judged with all the rigor of the law, and in the five last months of 1794 no less than 135 priests were shot or guillotined in various departments as well as the persons, mostly peasants or artisans, who had concealed them.

The great majority of the French Bishops and priests who had not accepted the *Constitution Civile* were then living in exile, having been either obliged to obey the law of deportation or having been expelled from their sees and their parishes by the intruding clergy, driven from one hiding place after another and forced at last to cross the frontier in order to save their lives. Only thirteen prelates had remained in France, three of whom were murdered at the convent of the Carmelites on September 2 and one at Versailles; one was guillotined in Paris, one died in prison and only two lived on into the nineteenth century. Though the exiled clergy had been flung upon the territories of the neighboring States without any warning having been given or any preparation made to receive them, their treatment as a rule did honor to the nations among whom their lot was cast. Those who took refuge in Spain, where by November,

1792, it is believed that they already numbered 3,000, came mostly from the southern provinces of France and were greeted with a most cordial reception. Prelates and religious communities vied with each other in offering them hospitality, and collections were made every year throughout Spain for their support. From time to time some of the exiles, deceived by temporary relaxations of the persecution, returned to France, only to be again driven back across the frontier, if indeed they succeeded in avoiding arrestation, followed by deportation or even death. As a precaution against these attempts to evade the law, Admiral Truguet was sent in 1798 by the Directory with an insolent demand that the Spanish Government should forthwith banish every French priest from its territory. The government feebly consented, but the Spanish Bishops and the monastic orders protested so strongly against this violation of the laws of hospitality that after 315 of the exiles had been sent to Majorca and a few to the Canary Islands the matter was allowed to drop. When the Consulate succeeded the Directory and the penal legislation was gradually revoked, the French clergy hastened to return to their homes, though their position was still uncertain until the law of 28th Vendémiaire an IX. (20th October, 1800) the names of the priests were effaced from the list of emigrants.

The exiles were still more numerous in the Papal States than in Spain. It was the only part of Italy where they found a safe refuge. Very few were admitted into the Kingdom of Naples; Lombardy, Parma, Modena and Tuscany were closed to them through the influence of Austria; the Venetian Senate was equally pitiless, and Piedmont was too much in dread of France to venture to shelter them. The Holy Father alone received them as hospitably as his resources allowed, and for that purpose he stopped all outlay on public works, reduced the expenses of his household and diminished the splendor of the ceremonies in St. Peter's. He instituted a commission, of which he was president, to provide for their wants, and a collection of sixty folio volumes entitled "*Caritas S. Sedis Apostolica erga Gallos*," now in the archives of the Vatican, contains the correspondence of Pius VI. and his ministers relating to the refugees, who in 1794, when large numbers of them had been driven out of Holland, amounted to 5,000. The invasion of the Papal States by the Revolutionary armies, and even the seizure of Rome by General Berthier made no change in their position, for they were allowed to remain unmolested, and according as peace was restored in France they gradually returned to their respective dioceses.

Switzerland and the Rhenish provinces were equally generous to the exiled clergy. Protestants vied with Catholics in assisting them with their alms. Even the city of Geneva, the headquarters of

Calvinism, gave hospitality to 600, and when menaced by the advance of the French army, transported them across Lake Lemán to a place of greater safety. But it was in England⁹ that by far the largest number of fugitives took refuge, and there only did they find a sure asylum from their enemies. The islands of Jersey and Guernsey were the first to receive those who fled from the western departments until the dread of an invasion rendered it advisable to transport them to England, where at the end of 1794 the number of priests registered as receiving assistance from the government was already 8,000, each of whom received £2 2s. a month (ten dollars and a half). Committees were formed to meet them as they landed and provide them with food and lodgings, and in the descriptions which some of them have left of their stay in England they praise loudly the tranquillity and safety which they enjoyed there, the hospitality which they received from all classes of society and the facilities granted to them for opening churches and founding schools for the children of the thousands of their fellow-countrymen who had also been obliged to fly from France to save their lives.

The Convention ended its existence by forming a new Constitution on the 5th Fructidor, an III. (22d August, 1795), which established a legislature composed of a Council of Ancients and a Council of Five Hundred, and placed the executive power in the hands of five Directors—La Dévellière-Lépeaux, Carnot, Barras, Rewbell and Letourneur. The first of these was a lawyer, as were, indeed, the majority of those who played the leading parts in the Revolution. He was animated by a bitter hatred against the Catholic Church, which he wished to see replaced by a religion named "theophilanthropy," of which he was said to be the founder, and like his fellow-directors, with the exception of Rewbell, he had voted for the death of Louis XVI. Carnot had been an officer of engineers. He had also formed part of the sanguinary committee of public safety and had caused the death of many of the friends of his colleagues; but he had now become one of the more moderate revolutionists, and his capacity for administration was much greater than that of the

⁹ L'Abbé Barruel, "Histoire du Clergé pendant la Révolution Française," A Londres, 1801, t. II, p. 194: "Il faut avoir été trois ans en France, au milieu des Constitutionnels, des Girondins, des Maratistes, des Jacobins de toute espèce pour sentir tout ce que ce premier aspect des Anglais avait de reposant, de délicieux pour chacun de ces prêtres, arrivant sur les côtes de la grande Bretagne." P. 196: "Chaque fois qu'un bâtiment chargé de ces prêtres Français paraissait sur la côte, on eût dit que l'instinct de la bienfaisance l'avait annoncé aux Anglais; ils arrivaient au port pour nous accueillir, c'était à qui nous offrirait une retraite ou des rafraîchissements. Nous débarquions par cinquante et par cent. . . . Dans les villes où les logements n'auraient pas suffi, on avait préparé un tien vaste et commun pour tous ceux qui manquaient de moyens."

other directors. Barras, a man of noble birth, but of tarnished reputation, laden with debt and an ardent revolutionist, had been one of the commissioners who had established the Reign of Terror at Toulon and Marseilles. He was given up to intrigue and debauchery; his avidity for money was notorious, and even Carnot described him as concealing the ferocity of a Caligula under an appearance of frivolity.

Rewbell was a lawyer from Alsace; thoroughly revolutionary in his principles and a bitter enemy of the clergy, in his management of the public money he was reproached with wastefulness, and Carnot, whose portraits of his fellow-directors are anything but flattering, denounced him as being the protector of persons accused of theft and malversation and as being convinced that probity and patriotism were absolutely incompatible. The last of the group, Letourneur, had been, like Carnot, an officer of engineers, whose military experience had procured for him a place on the committee of public safety. He exercised no influence in his new position and was soon replaced by Barthélemy, who had been the envoy of the republic in Switzerland.

In the last year of the rule of the Convention that Assembly had published several decrees which under an appearance of toleration were aimed at the abolition of the official schismatic Church, and which left the Catholics very nearly as much oppressed as before. The first was dated on the second day of the *Sans-Culottides de an II.* (18th September, 1794), and declared that the republic would no longer pay salaries to the ministers of any form of worship, but would grant a small pension to the members of the constitutional clergy. This meant the suppression of the church founded by the Jansenists of the *Assemblée Nationale*, which the Voltairians, who had assisted them, hated as much as the Catholic Church, and which, having served its purpose of inaugurating the persecution, could now be flung aside. This law was confirmed by that of the 3d Ventôse an III. (21st February, 1795), which announced that the republic would not provide any place for the celebration of public worship; forbade the municipalities to do so by purchase or hire, and prohibited any public ceremony or outward manifestation of religion.

The people, however, in some of the southern departments had already begun to take advantage of the relaxation of the persecution which followed the death of Robespierre. They took possession of churches which had been closed; priests who had been in hiding reappeared; in villages where there was no priest the schoolmaster read prayers to the assembled peasants; in some localities the sound of the Angelus bell was again heard, and though the commissioners sent by the Convention could still manifest their hatred of religion

by their proclamations and seek to impose the observance of the *Décadi* instead of Sunday, they could no longer employ the guillotine to enforce obedience.

The Convention, therefore, made some very slight advance in the direction of religious liberty by the law of the 11th Prairial, an III. (30th May, 1795), which granted provisionally to the municipalities the use of a few churches which should be common both to the Catholics and to the schismatics; but no priest could officiate therein unless he made a public declaration of submission to the laws of the republic. But as the laws which condemned to deportation any priest who refused to take the oath to the *Constitution Civile*, or to death if he returned from exile, were still in existence, only very few members of the clergy who did not come under those laws, such as the aged and the infirm and those who had been recently ordained, could venture to appear in public to make this declaration, and many of them considered it to be incompatible with the fidelity which they owed to their lawful sovereign.

The execution of these laws varied in the different departments. At Rennes, in Brittany, the irritation manifested by the people had obliged the commissioners to allow several priests to make a qualified act of submission to the republic, while reserving all the rights of the Church, and in the departments bordering on Switzerland the clergy returned in large numbers, celebrated Mass publicly, and if arrested, were in many instances rescued by the peasants. Many were, however, still in prison. The committee of public safety (*comité de sûreté générale*) sent orders to the local authorities to execute rigorously the laws against the priests who returned from abroad, and on the 20th Fructidor, an III. (6th September, 1795), the Convention, which mingled fresh decrees of proscription with its slight concessions, gave all the priests who had been banished and had come back fifteen days to leave France and menaced them with death if they again entered the territory of the republic. Moreover, those who should refuse to make the declaration of submission or who should retract it after making it were to be immediately imprisoned if they performed any act of worship even in a private house.

This was followed on the 7th Vendémiaire, an IV. (28th September, 1795), by another law which placed every meeting of citizens for the purpose of worship under the supervision of the authorities; declared that no one could be obliged to celebrate a feast or abstain from work on any particular day; forbade any religious ceremonies from taking place in public, and limited to ten the number of persons who could assist at them in a private house over and above those residing in the same building. Other clauses prohibited the publication of any document emanating from any minister of worship dwell-

ing outside the republic, and condemned to prison for life any clergyman found guilty of seeking to restore the monarchy or encouraging soldiers to desert or exciting rebellion against the government. Another form of declaration of submission to the republic was also provided, as if those already existing did not suffice to guarantee its safety. It consisted in acknowledging that the totality of French citizens was sovereign and in promising submission and obedience to the laws of the republic. Any minister of public worship who exercised his functions without making this declaration should be fined and imprisoned, and if he modified it or retracted it, he should be banished for life. As a final act of hostility towards the Church the Convention before it separated decreed on the 3d Brumaire, an IV. (25th October, 1795), that all the laws of 1792 and of 1793 against priests who were liable to deportation or imprisonment should be executed within twenty-four hours, and that the public functionaries who should neglect to do so should be punished with two years' imprisonment. On the following day it granted a general amnesty "for all matters connected with the revolution," but excluded from it priests who had been deported or were liable to deportation and persons who had emigrated. The Catholics had, however, reaped some slight advantage from the law of the 11th Prairial, in virtue of which fifteen churches were allowed to be opened in Paris, besides a number of private oratories, most of which were in the hands of the Catholic clergy; and a report drawn up by the police by the order of the Directory, dated 8th Floréal, an IV. (27th April, 1796), gives the number of churches and oratories known to the authorities as thirty-five, and that of the priests as at least 300, many of whom, it is true, were schismatic, while those who were Catholic had either retracted the first oath or had taken that prescribed in Vendémiaire with the consent of their ecclesiastical superiors. Many others, too, who had refused to take any oath were still concealed in Paris under various disguises and said Mass secretly in private houses.

When the Directory undertook the government of France the country was in a state of complete anarchy. In many places the people wanted bread; the roads were infested by armed bands of robbers; officials and contractors were amassing large fortunes by plundering the State. Though the nation was weary of the Revolution and longed for order and tranquillity, the first object of the new administration was to continue and even to increase the persecution of the Church. Thus by a circular of the 23d Nivôse, an IV. (13th January, 1796), addressed to the provincial authorities, they ordered all the laws against the clergy to be rigorously enforced, especially those of 1792 and 1793, which condemned to death any priest who returned to France after having been deported, or who, being liable to im-

prisonment, had not surrendered, but had hidden himself, as well as those who had concealed him. It was a return to the worst days of the Reign of Terror.¹⁰

The practical effect of these orders was not the same all over France. In many places they could not be carried out owing to the indignation shown by the people. Some municipalities were friendly to the clergy and were willing to give certificates to priests who took the oath only with restrictions. In some places the numbers of the faithful were so large that the churches could be opened and Divine worship celebrated, while the Jacobins did not dare to interfere; in others, on the contrary, the Catholics were driven to hear Mass in secret. It was in the west of France that the persecution was most severe, for there, owing to the prolonged resistance of the *Chouans*, or bands of armed peasants, who continued to carry on the war of *la Vendée* in the departments to the north of the Loire, flying columns of soldiers had been organized, and they also searched for concealed priests, whom, under the pretext that they assisted the insurgents, they immediately shot or bayoneted without any form of trial. This summary mode of procedure was never checked by the government, and it lasted until the time of the Concordat; for it suited perfectly the views of the Directory, as, if the victims had been allowed to defend themselves before a court of law, they might have a chance of being acquitted; and if they were condemned, their execution in public might revolt and exasperate the people. In the north and east of France, on the other hand, the priests who had fled the country were beginning to return; they were reopening the churches and administering the sacraments, and many of those who had taken the oath to the *Constitution Civile* were now retracting it and repenting their error.

There was a slight relaxation of the persecution when on the 14th Frimaire, an V. (4th December, 1796), both Councils repealed some of the clauses of the law of the 3d Brumaire, an IV. (25th October, 1795), and among others the tenth, which decreed the execution of the laws of 1792 and 1793 within twenty-four hours, and many priests were set free in consequence by provincial administrations, in spite of the opposition of the Directors, who maintained that the law of Brumaire merely enforced a more strict execution of previous

¹⁰ The Directory had already showed by what spirit it was animated in the instructions which it had sent to the national commissioners in each department with regard to the priests who had refused to take the oath: "Déjouez leurs perfides projets sur une surveillance active, continuelle, infatigable; rompez leurs mesures, entravez leurs mouvements, désolés leur patience, environnez-les de votre surveillance; qu'elle les inquiète le jour, qu'elle les trouble la nuit; ne leur donnez pas de relâche; que, sans vous voir, ils vous sentent partout à chaque instant." Quoted by Picot, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., p. 4, from the *Moniteur* of 19 Frimaire, an iv. (December 10, 1795).

laws, which were by no means abrogated by its repeal, and they continued to stimulate the animosity of their subordinates against the clergy until the elections took place by which a third of the Councils was to be renewed.

When the new Constitution had been created in 1795 the Convention had decreed that two-thirds of the new Councils should be formed of its members, assuring thereby a majority in the government to the men of advanced revolutionary opinions, under whose rule France had been drenched with blood. It did not, indeed, obtain the majority on which it had reckoned, as only 379 Conventionals were elected instead of the number they had hoped to obtain; but at the election of the 20th Germinal, an V., when one-third of the Councils was to be renewed, the Moderates, among whom were many Royalists, obtained a decided victory and found themselves in a large majority when the Councils met on the 1st Prairial (20th May). As petitions were now pouring in from all parts of France demanding liberty of worship and the recall of the exiled clergy, a commission was named to examine the question, and after considerable discussion the laws which sentenced priests to deportation or to prison for refusing to take any oath, as well as those which placed exiled priests in the same category as the *émigrés*, or punished the persons who sheltered the proscribed clergy were repealed on the 27th Messidor, an V. (1st July, 1797), by the Council of Five Hundred, and on the 7th Fructidor (24th August) this decision was ratified almost unanimously by the Council of the Ancients. The Councils were also about to sanction a purely political form of declaration of submission to the government of the republic, which every priest was to be bound to sign, but before it could be adopted an unexpected Revolution took place which revived the persecution with all its former bitterness.

Three of the Directors—Barras, Rewbell and La Révellière-Lépeaux—who represented the more corrupt and revolutionary element in the executive, saw that their power would soon be overturned by the Moderate majority in the Councils, which was resolved to restore peace and religious liberty to France; to establish order in the finances and honesty in the public service, and to change the foreign policy of the Directorate, which aimed at maintaining a state of warfare in Europe. They determined, therefore, by a sudden attack on the Councils to expel the Moderates and replace them by their partisans—the men who hated religion and who had gained by the Revolution; who had hunted priests and plundered churches; the speculators and contractors who drove advantageous bargains with them to the detriment of the State and for whom the triumphs of the Moderates meant the end of their illicit profits and a well-

merited chastisement. The Councils foresaw the danger which menaced them, but the more moderate members preferred to temporize instead of acting with decision; while the Directors, who were devoid of all scruples and who knew that they could reckon on the army, most of whose chiefs professed Jacobin opinions, assembled troops in the neighborhood of Paris, and gave their command to Augereau, a brave soldier, but ignorant and narrow-minded and an ardent Jacobin, who had been sent to them by Bonaparte from the army of Italy. More battalions were brought into the city by night, and at dawn on the 18th Fructidor, an V. (4th September, 1797), Augereau's soldiers seized the Tuileries, where the Councils held their sittings, and a proclamation, posted everywhere, informed the citizens of Paris of the discovery of a conspiracy of royalists and Vendéans which had been formed to assassinate the Directors, and that an attack had even been made on the guards of the palace of the Luxembourg, where they resided.

The members of the Councils who were favorable to the Directors (all the others had been driven away or arrested) immediately voted a law of proscription which empowered the government to deport Carnot and Barthélemy along with forty-two members of the Council of Five Hundred, eleven of the Council of the Ancients and some other political personages to the number of sixty-five in all, as well as the owners and editors of several newspapers. It also decreed that all emigrants returning to France should be shot within twenty-four hours; that any priest who should disturb public tranquillity should be deported, and that every priest allowed to remain on the territory of the republic should swear hatred to royalty and to anarchy and fidelity to the republic. The elections in forty-nine departments were also annulled. Persons related to emigrants were deprived of the right to vote, and the Directors were authorized to fill all vacancies in the courts of law. François (of Neufchateau) and Merlin (of Douai) were chosen to replace Carnot and Barthélemy, the former of whom, together with the majority of those who had been proscribed, escaped in time, and only sixteen were arrested and sent to Guyana.

It has been calculated that at that time there cannot have been more than 7,000 or 8,000 priests remaining in France, whether Catholic or schismatic, and against them there were published between the 18th Fructidor (4th September, 1797) and the 30th Prairial, an VII. (18th June, 1799), when the more fanatical members of the Directory were forced to resign, no less than 1,724 sentences of deportation. A considerable number, however, of those who were proscribed succeeded in evading arrest and concealing themselves, but 697 were imprisoned in the citadel on the Island of Ré,

66 in that on the Island of Oléron and 232 were deported to Guyana.

A still greater number of decrees were published against the Belgian clergy, which up to 1797 had undergone but little persecution, for although when Belgium had been first invaded by Dumouriez in 1792 the churches and the religious houses had been mercilessly plundered by the Jacobin commissioners sent from Paris, until even the general protested with indignation, no attempt had been made to introduce the *Constitution Civile*. But Belgium had been invaded again in 1794, the churches were again pillaged and whatever plate remained sent to Paris. The taxation of the country was increased to six times its former amount, and the Jacobins raised the guillotine and ruled by terror as in France. Some months after the fall of Robespierre a certain degree of toleration was granted, but on September 30, 1795, Belgium was annexed to France and divided into nine departments. The religious orders were suppressed and all Church property was confiscated, but instead of the *Constitution Civile* the oath of the 7th Vendémiaire, an IV. (28th September, 1795), which acknowledged the sovereignty of the people and promised submission to the laws of the republic, was imposed. The great majority of the Belgian clergy refused to take it, and the faculty of theology of the University of Louvain approved of their decision, but all public worship was suspended, though petitions demanding religious liberty and covered with thousands of signatures were forwarded from all parts of Belgium to the French Government. The decree of 24th August, 1797, by which the renovated Councils abrogated the most severe of the penal laws against the clergy, gave the Belgian Church at least some hope of peace, but after the treacherous betrayal of the 18th Fructidor the Directory extended to Belgium the same system of religious persecution that they had inflicted on France.

In October, 1797, Cardinal de Frankenberg, Archbishop of Malines and primate of Belgium, who had so courageously defended the liberties of the Church against Joseph II., was seized and sent into Germany. The University of Louvain was suppressed and the rector, Jean Joseph Havelange, deported to Guyana, where he died. All outward signs of religion were ordered to be destroyed; the crosses were pulled down from the steeples; the statues of the saints removed from their niches; the ringing of bells was forbidden, and the churches were closed. At last the Belgian people, goaded to madness by the outrages to religion and the exactions of the Directory, rose in rebellion. The immediate cause was the attempt to introduce the law of conscription which was proclaimed in Brussels on the 28th September, 1798, and was immediately followed by the appearance

of armed bands in every part of the country. The struggle was desperate, but of short duration, for though the insurgents fought bravely, they obeyed no central authority, they followed no settled plan, the few victories they achieved led to no practical result, and by the end of December, 1798, the movement was suppressed.

In the meanwhile, by a decree of the Directory dated 14th Brumaire, an VII. (4th November, 1798), some thousands of Belgian priests accused of being the enemies of France; of impeding the action of the government; of disparaging republican institutions, and of organizing the insurrection then in progress, were condemned to be deported. The sentence, happily, could not be carried out as fully as the Directors had intended, for though the clergy were pursued with the same animosity as in France, the greater number of those proscribed fled across the frontier, and others hid themselves and continued to minister secretly to their flocks while leading lives of unceasing dangers and privations. No less than 7,478 priests were mentioned by name in this document; 585 had been comprised in a previous decree and 162 in others which were published subsequently, amounting in all to 8,225; but the number of those actually deported to Guyana along with the French priests was 30, to the Islands of Ré, 222, and to the Island of Oléron, 126.

Rochefort was the first prison in which the persons, both lay and clerical, proscribed by the Directory were confined till they could be sent to Guyana, but the citadels on the Islands of Ré and Oléron were before long substituted for that colony, as the English cruisers rarely allowed any vessel to leave the port. At Guyana the greater number of those who were deported were sent to a station 30 leagues to the west of Cayenne named Conanama, the most pestilential spot in the colony, where they were lodged in roughly built huts and where they were so decimated by fever that when after four months a tardy feeling of compassion induced the authorities to transfer them to Sinnamary, a somewhat less unwholesome locality, sixty-nine out of 161 had already perished. At Sinnamary, an ancient mission of the Jesuits, the ruins of whose church still remained, the life of the exiles was somewhat less wretched. They even found means to say Mass in secret and teach Christianity to the Negroes of the colony. It was only some months after the fall of the Directory that by a decree of the Consuls of the 19th Fructidor, an VIII. (6th September, 1800), that the priests detained in Guyana were ordered to be brought back to the Islands of Oléron and Ré, where they were to present their claims to be set free, if they thought that the laws gave them that right. Their return took place very slowly by small detachments, about half on vessels of the State, the others on merchant ships at their own expense. Of the 263 priests banished to Guyana

160 had died there, and the system of deportation so favored by the Directory under the specious pretext of humanity had well earned its name of "*la guillotine sèche*," the bloodless guillotine.

The members of the clergy who were imprisoned in the citadels on the Islands of Ré and Oléron, though undergoing much suffering from overcrowding, insufficient food and insolence on the part of the officials, were at least spared the deadly climate of Guyana. On the Island of Ré, where they were more numerous, they lived as in a religious community. They established conferences on the Holy Scriptures and theology; they even prevailed over the ill-will of their gaolers so far as to be allowed to celebrate Mass, and the vestments which they made, the altar slabs, the sacred vessels which they used are still preserved as precious relics of a time of persecution in the Church of St. Martin on the island. After the fall of the Directory a decree of the Consular Government set free only the priests who had taken the oaths prescribed by various laws (for schismatics as well as Catholics had been deported), but many who had not taken them escaped at the same time. The Belgians were liberated in the beginning of the year 1800. Many were allowed to escape by the connivance of the authorities, and by the month of June nearly all the prisoners had left the island.

The Directory was as ardent as the Convention in seeking to impose on the nation the republican calendar which was proclaimed by the decree of the 14th Germinal, an VI. (3d April, 1798), as an institution most suitable for obliterating the last traces of the monarchical, aristocratic and religious rule. Every effort was made to hinder the observance of Sunday as a day of rest and replace it by the *Décadi*, and even the sale of fish on days of fasting and abstinence was forbidden.¹¹ But neither the vexatious interference of the police regulations with the markets and with the itinerant vendors in the streets nor fines and imprisonment were able to conquer the resistance of the people, which, as the reports sent to the Directory from all parts of France bear witness, still remained faithfully attached to the observance of Sunday and of the feasts of the Church.

But the corruption of the Directors and their scandalous mismanagement of public affairs had excited against them the animosity of the two Councils, which insisted on the resignation of Merlin and La Révellière, who were the special objects of their hatred, and on the 30th Prairial, an VII. (18th June, 1799), the Directory was almost completely renewed. Sieyès took the place of Rewbell, whose term of office had expired. Gohier took that of Treilhard, whose

¹¹ Sciout, "Hist. de la Constitution Civile du Clergé," t. IV., p. 688: "Elles (les administrations municipales) s'attacheront spécialement à rompre tout rapport des marchés à poissons avec les jours d'abstinence désignés par l'ancien calendrier."

election was annulled, and Merlin and La Révellière withdrew in favor of Roger-Ducos and General Moulins. Barras alone remained of the original Directory. Nothing, however, was changed in the relations of the new Directors with the Catholic Church or in the lamentable condition of France. The country was impoverished by taxation; its commerce and its manufactures were nearly destroyed; bands of royalists were still fighting in the western departments; in the rest of France the high roads were infested with brigands; all public buildings and the edifices confiscated from the Church by the State were falling into ruin, for they had never been repaired since they had passed into the hands of the revolutionists, and in spite of the millions which the Convention and the Directory had plundered both from France and from the countries which had been occupied by the armies of the republic, there was not money enough in the treasury to pay the salaries of the public functionaries.

The French nation was weary of the Revolution and of its incompetent government. It saw that only a powerful dictator could save France from utter ruin, and when Bonaparte returned from Egypt he was hailed with enthusiasm as the only man capable of restoring order and prosperity. Bonaparte soon gained over to his side several of the members of the Council of the Ancients, and with their help and by his daring action on the 18th of Brumaire, an VIII. (10th November, 1799), he forced the Councils to adjourn after naming him Consul along with Sieyès and Ducos. When thus raised to the supreme power (for his colleagues had no real authority) Bonaparte adopted a more conciliatory policy towards the Church, slowly, it is true, and at first apparently with reluctance on account of the fanaticism of the Revolutionists who surrounded him and whom he was obliged to conciliate. But before studying the events which took place under the Consulate and the reconciliation of France with the Holy See it will be necessary to pass in review the course of the Revolution in Italy, its disastrous effect upon the people and the country, and above all its treatment of the Sovereign Pontiff Pius VI.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London.

A TRANSFORMATION.

SOME years ago few drearier spots could be found in Ireland than the village of Foxford, in the County Mayo, which is one of the most congested parts of Connemara. One long, straggling street, silent and deserted, on each side a row of tumble-down cottages, badly thatched, damp, dirty—such was Foxford. A stagnant, desolate spot. The one thing of life was the swift flowing river, the rush of whose rapid waters seemed in startling contradiction to the prevailing stillness and torpor. On market days a semblance of life was given to the decaying village by the presence of men and women who came from the surrounding glens and mountains to haggle over the sale of a cow or calf or pig. But the loneliness of the wretched village was less depressing than this throng of hungry-looking human beings, whose rags hung loosely on their gaunt figures and whose dull eyes looked forth from cavernous depths with an apathetic stare, for it revealed the existence of deeper and more widespread misery and suffering.

The village is surrounded by bleak mountains and tracts of bog strewn with boulders which give a sombre gray look to the landscape. The soil is barren and hard to cultivate, and there is almost complete dearth of pasture. Scattered over this desolate tract are miserable holdings, rarely exceeding two or three acres in extent. The owner of eight or ten acres is regarded as a "strong farmer." The peasants work on these patches of boggy, unproductive land during the winter months, but with the beginning of spring all the men and youths take their departure for the agricultural districts of England, where they work as laborers until the advent of winter brings them home again, having earned during those months of exile sufficient to pay the rent for their wretched bit of land. Agriculture as practiced in Foxford was of the most primitive kind. When a bit of pasturage was wanted, instead of sowing grass seed, the land was left to the operation of nature. The winds might carry to it seeds from some other field, and by this slow process at the end of three years the ground would be covered with a thin mantle of green, weeds being far more plentiful than grass. No one ever thought of sowing new varieties of potato seed, so as to avert the danger of using seed taken from a field ravaged by "the blight," while prejudice prevented the employment of preventive measures to stay this fell destroyer.

The habitations of the peasants consisted of miserable hovels, many of them having neither chimney, nor fireplace, nor window; the turf fire burned in the centre of the floor, the smoke escaping

through a crevice in the roof, but more often by the door, close to which was the pestilential manure heap, poisoning the air and breeding deadly disease. Is it to be wondered at that at certain seasons typhoid fever was constantly recurrent as an epidemic? The one apartment which these hovels contained was shared by the inmates with the cattle and the pig. Within a radius of five miles 1,100 such abodes might be counted, and yet these people were not brutalized by their surroundings. The spiritual imaginative nature of the Celt soared above his squalid surroundings. He dreamed his days away blissfully indifferent to all discomfort. The brown, wind-swept bog and the mountains, with their shifting lights and shadows, are dream inducing. He knew the favorite haunts of the fairies, the "good people" as he terms them, and was well versed in the ways of the capricious elfin race whom it is so dangerous for mortals to offend. What marvelous stories of their power had he not heard from earliest childhood, told by the elders as they sat round the fire during the long winter nights.

These Connaught peasants, in the midst of poverty and dirt, are kindly, patient, resigned. It has been sometimes said that their resignation is akin to Oriental fatalism and is due to their Eastern origin. Courtesy to the stranger is one of their most marked characteristics. The "woman of the house" will welcome you to her poor cabin and give you the best seat it possesses. She will listen while you talk, never obtruding herself or her wants unless you question her. She identifies herself completely with her guests with an innate refinement which would become the highest in the land.

Much had been said and written about the terrible state of Foxford. Roman Catholic clergymen who visited the place from time to time for the purpose of giving missions declared it to be one of the most destitute districts they had ever seen. When Mr. Balfour went there in 1890, in order to assure himself by personal observation that the distress was not exaggerated, he was so impressed by the misery which he saw that he at once started relief works. So things went on until the year 1891, when a few Sisters of Charity took up their abode in the wretched village. The management of the national schools was confided to them, with the result that a marked improvement took place in the attendance, which previously had been lamentably out of all proportion to the population. The Sisters made a tour of inspection, hunted up the truants and found that in many instances non-attendance at school arose not so much from the parents' indifference as from the poor children not having clothes. Aided by friends, the nuns soon removed this obstacle.

Under their management the schools prospered. From far and near the children trooped in, attracted by the novelty of the new

régime, and still more so by the breakfast of milk and porridge which each one received. Poor children, a good meal was indeed a novel experience in their lives. But what was to be the future of these bright, eager children when the time came for them to leave school? Such was the anxious problem which suggested itself to the teachers. Were those bright, intelligent spirits to grow dull and dim—to sink into the listless apathy of the parents? Were they, too, doomed to drag out a wretched existence in poverty and dirt? The stony, barren soil had been taxed to its utmost and could support no more, even on starvation diet. Sub-division of the holdings had already worked much of the prevailing misery. Besides, education, which taught them the existence of better things, would create in those young souls discontent with the squalid misery of their homes. No resource was left save emigration to the great Republic of the West, there, most likely, to go down in the fierce struggle and be lost in the seething vortex of vice and misery of those Western cities, compared to which their mountain cabins were as Paradise.

The roar of the river heard by the nuns as they meditated on this question during the quiet hours of the night furnished the key to the problem. This great water power rushing to waste could and should be utilized to save the young generation. With these quick-witted women to think was to act. In an incredibly short space of time a factory was started provided with requisite machinery for the weaving of all kinds of woolen cloth, from the roughest frieze to the finest tweed for ladies' wear. The new venture had many difficulties to contend with at first—the objections of friends as well as foes, reverses, discouragement of all kinds. But the brave spirit of these women who were working for the regeneration of their fellow-beings carried them triumphant through all. The Congested Districts Board, which has done such good service in Ireland, came to their assistance with a gift of £1,500 and a loan of £7,000. This generous help enabled them to build the factory and stock it with first-rate machinery. Without such aid the project must have fallen through. To-day the factory is an unqualified success, providing employment to the youth of the whole district and famous for the excellence of its manufactures. And this, though the nuns are heavily handicapped with the payment of the interest, £600 yearly, on the loan of £7,000. But the work of the Sisters was not yet at an end. Success whetted their desire for further conquest. Something must be done to improve the homes of the peasants so that they might be no longer eyesores and plague spots, blots on the face of nature. And here the reformers set themselves a task, compared to which the starting of the factory was as child's play.

The Irish peasant is intensely conservative. He clings tenaciously to the customs and habits of his forefathers. He dislikes new-fangled ways; what was good enough for those who went before him is good enough for him. So he reasons. Besides, it must be remembered that those poor people knew nothing of the comforts of life. The advantages of cleanliness were practically unknown to them. They had been born and had grown old in the midst of poverty and dirt. They were listless with the listlessness born of bad, insufficient food, unhealthy surroundings and the want of any aim or object in life. It is hard, extremely hard, to convince a man of the advantages of a thing of which he has not the least conception. Well-fed, well-clad reformers whose lives have been spent in comfortable refined homes ought to remember this when they are tempted to rail at the squalid, dirty habits of the wretched denizens of foul slums.

But nothing daunted, the Sisters went to work. They advised, they pleaded, they cajoled, they bribed. Inch by inch they fought their way. By dint of superhuman patience and perseverance they succeeded in getting the manure heap removed to a safe distance from the door. The next step was to sow the space thus left vacant with simple flowers and vegetables, the nuns supplying the seeds. In all this the youth of the district proved powerful allies, in many instances the reformation being effected by their willing hands during the father's absence at a fair or neighboring town. The next step was to have the live stock removed from the dwelling. Timber and corrugated iron were forthcoming for the erection of a cattle-shed, and even the services of a carpenter from the factory at Foxford. Next attention was turned to the dwellings. Doors and windows were suggested, the suggestion, as usual, being accompanied by the offer of what was needful to carry it out. Apathy now gave way to the keenest interest. Men who had, with the utmost difficulty, been induced to remove the manure heap from before their doors manifested the greatest interest in the improvement of their houses, revealing at the same time unsuspected taste and skill. Gradually, but surely, the wretched hovels disappeared and neat cottages took their place, each with a shed attached for the live stock. The vegetables grown in the cottage gardens formed a welcome and hitherto unknown addition to the daily fare, the finest specimens being exhibited at the Cottage Industries Show which is held every year.

A friend who watched with keen interest the Sisters' work placed at their disposal a number of fruit trees. Forty families were chosen who were most likely to profit by the gift, and to each one ten trees were given. The trees were tended with great care and

now yield abundant crops. Forest trees were also obtained and distributed in the same judicious manner, with the result that the former gray, desolate landscape is now pleasantly diversified with white cottages surrounded by sturdy young chestnuts, sycamores and other trees.

The peasants have further been induced to employ modern agricultural methods in the cultivation of their tiny farms. Good crops of barley and oats are raised, and rye grass grows luxuriantly in the patches of meadow land. New varieties of potato seed are constantly planted, and it is no longer regarded as "flying in the face of God" to hinder the ravages of blight by the use of the spraying machine. The women, too, have been taught the value of poultry as a means of adding to the domestic revenues. Good breeds of laying hens have been introduced and instruction given in their proper care and management, so that the export of eggs promises in a little time to become considerable.

The Foxford of to-day is no longer the silent, deserted village of ten years ago. It is filled with the bustle and hum of prosperous life. Its houses are in good repair, the shops thriving, the one hotel clean and comfortable. From the mill built on the river at stated hours streams forth a crowd of bright, intelligent young people of both sexes, full of the joy of living which comes from healthful, cleanly surroundings and the consciousness of hours well spent in profitable labor. Eyesores and plague spots, wretched hovels and noisome manure heaps have vanished from the surrounding district. Snug cottages and pretty gardens have taken their place. The people no longer wear that listless look born of famine and despair; they are healthy and alert, as with renewed hope and life. Not that these peasants have become rich or that poverty has been banished from their midst. That would be impossible. Those little holdings of three, four or even ten acres of stony soil could never be productive of wealth. But they have learned to make the most of their resources; they have been taught the advantages of order and cleanliness. While remaining poor, they have become clean, tasteful, thrifty.

Such is the tremendous transformation effected in Foxford within the space of six years by a few women who have embraced a life of poverty and self-sacrifice. Not without great labor and at the cost of much heroic patience and self-denial have these marvelous results been obtained. Those apostles of decency and cleanliness lived amongst the people they would benefit, identifying themselves with them in every respect, sorrowing with them in their sorrows, rejoicing with them in their rare joys, bearing sweetly and patiently with all their faults and shortcomings, preaching as much by the

daily example of their own beautiful lives as by their words. These were no harsh censors, come to denounce and condemn from their lofty pedestals of virtue. They were the gentle, sympathetic friends of the people, with no end in view save the welfare of those for whom they labored. Would-be reformers of the poor and the dirty might do worse than imitate their methods.

The story of Foxford is interesting and at the same time instructive, showing as it does how a whole district was rescued from appalling destitution and the population lifted from the slough of hopeless apathy, so that where once poverty and her handmaidens, disease and dirt, stalked triumphant, industry and cleanliness now reign supreme. The story is rendered still more interesting by the fact that this was accomplished not by elaborate government measures nor munificent gifts from millionaires, but solely by the efforts of a few weak women whose lives were vowed to the service of their fellow-creatures.

E. LEAHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

JAMES BARRY.

THE inquisitive sightseer or critical *dilettante*, ubiquitous tourist or picture gallery lounge, loitering through the national portrait galleries in London or Dublin or the rooms of the Society of Arts, Adelphi, may have his attention arrested for a moment by a small but rather remarkable portrait, which a closer glance will discover to be that of James Barry, the celebrated Irish artist, the painter of the famous Adelphi pictures, the contemporary and rival of Reynolds. The portrait, painted by his own hand—the hand that did enough for fame, if not for fortune, and left imperishable memorials of the genius that guided it and illustrated the dawn of British art—is only a head; but such a head! Eyes, deep-sunken under shaggy brows, gleam with the light of genius and seem to look out abstractedly from the canvas into vacancy, like one lost in thought; while a heavy mass of hair, rude and unkempt, frames a face which would have been a study for Lavater—a face in which those who run may read the mind's construction, and in which all the more striking characteristics of the Celt are strongly marked, revealing to the hastiest glance the nationality of the original.

Barry was born on the 11th of October, 1741, in Water lane (now

called Seminary road), Blackpool, on the northern outskirts of Cork, not far from the Catholic Cathedral and at the base of a hill topped by the diocesan college and Bishop's house. A marble tablet inserted in the side wall marks the house, renovated and modernized, in which he first saw the light. The son of the captain of a small coasting vessel—who was also a publican¹ on shore, had been a builder in a small way—and almost literally “cradled by the rude, imperious surge,” since he was taken to sea at a very early age to be taught how to hand, reef, steer and box the compass, the young Blackpudlian was designed by his father—one of those *travailleurs sur mer* who cruise the Irish Channel—for a seafaring life. But nature had cast the plastic mind of Barry in a different mould, and fate had other designs in his regard than those entertained by the worthy “skipper.” The bent of his genius soon revealed itself. A “life on the ocean wave,” however inspiring a theme it may be for poets and songsters, is apt to lose much of its attraction when the distance which “lends enchantment to the view” is decreased, and instead of

. . . the pulse's maddening play
Which thrills the wanderer of that trackless way,

one is thrilled with quite other sensations. But young Barry found an antidote against seasickness in the art which had already captivated his youthful imagination, and relieved the monotony of the short voyages he made along with his father by sketching in red and white chalk bits of coast scenery and other subjects that accidentally attracted his quick, appreciative eye. His extraordinarily rapid progress in drawing, self-acquired, and certain very pronounced traits of character—the germs of that strong individuality that became developed or over-developed in after years—together with the fact of his running away from the vessel, his ardent, active, self-willed nature rebelling against the tedium and restraints of life on board ship, convinced his father of his unfitness for that calling, and he was sent to school. The ripeness of his intelligence, which soon grasped all the rudimentary knowledge that his teacher could impart, and was cultivated and expanded by a private course of discursive reading—every book he could lay hands on being quickly and eagerly devoured, and the contents transcribed or committed to memory—and a deep religious sense imbibed from his mother, who was a devout Catholic, suggested the propriety of having him educated for admiration and began to attract the notice of local connoisseurs.

Left free to follow his favorite pursuit, it absorbed all his attention, as the walls of his father's humble dwelling, chalked with

¹ Barry painted the sign for his father's public-house on the quay—Neptune on one side and a ship of that name on the other.

figures and other *al fresco* traces of his juvenile pencil testified. So intense was his application that he used to lock himself into his room and prolong his studies far into the night, until his mother, fearing that his health would break down or the house would be burned, deprived him of his candle; but only to afford her resolute son another opportunity of breaking through every restraint that would fetter his mind and exercising his ingenuity in supplying the want. Knowing that art is long and time is fleeting, he anticipated Moore and thought it wise to lengthen his days by stealing a few hours from the night; and, with a keener appetite for food for the mind than food for the body, contented himself with the coarsest and most meagre diet, and slept on the bare boards. Thus, endeavoring to make up for technical instruction in the mechanism of art by unwearied assiduity and a self-imposed discipline that savored of monastic austerity, he soon began to display a grasp of mind and a cunning of hand that filled his family and friends with ingenuous admiration and began to attract the notice of local connoisseurs.

At seventeen he began to paint, being already "master of a rough, bold and not inexpressive delineation of the linear elements of form." Five years later, in 1763, he sought a larger arena for the employment and display of talents, for the culture and utilization of which his native city afforded but few opportunities, and went to Dublin with several paintings, opportunely on the eve of an exhibition of pictures by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts and Manufactures in Ireland, subsequently known as the Royal Dublin Society. These results of his industrious pursuit of art under difficulties comprised "Æneas Escaping with His Father from the Siege of Troy," a "Dead Christ," "Susanna and the Elders," "Daniel in the Lions' Den," "Abraham's Sacrifice" and "The Baptism of the King of Cashel." The last named was a pictorial reproduction of the well-known legend of the baptism of Ængus, King of Cashel, by St. Patrick. The saint was represented leaning upon his crozier, with the point of which he has inadvertently pierced the monarch's foot; the King's guards, about to rush at the Apostle, are restrained by the heroic calmness of the young sovereign, who, thinking it is part of the ceremony, remains unmoved, while the bystanders gaze upon the scene in silent wonderment. The subject was a very happy selection, and at his own solicitation the picture was hung near two historical paintings by two eminent contemporary Irish artists, one of whom had studied in Italy. Barry's estimate of his own work, which thus challenged comparison with that of the best artists of the day, did not deceive him as to its intrinsic merits, which were readily recognized by the visitors to the exhibition, whither he hastened on the opening day to drink in with delighted ears the

applause lavishly bestowed upon his performance and see with his own eyes surprise and admiration depicted on the eager faces of those who thronged round his picture. Admiration soon gave rise to curiosity, and speculation was rife as to who was the artist—none could tell—when Barry, unable to contain himself any longer, came forward and said: "It is my picture." The gaze of the spectators, averted for a moment from the picture to the painter, lighted upon a youth whose rough, homespun garb and unsophisticated appearance seemed to cast a doubt upon his assertion, which was received with a laugh or a smile of incredulity. "Why do you doubt my word?" he added, full of the pride of conscious power. "I can paint a better." But they only smiled or laughed the more or turned aside with a shrug of the shoulders, until a person who knew him came up and established his identity. He was voted by the society a premium of twenty pounds, and the picture was purchased for presentation to the Irish House of Commons, where it was lost forever in the fire which shortly after occurred.

But the "open sesame" that unlocked for Barry the cave of fortune was a letter of introduction from Dr. Sleigh, of Cork, to Edmund Burke, then private secretary to William Gerard Hamilton—"single speech Hamilton"—who had come over as chief secretary with Lord Halifax in 1761. Their acquaintance from first to last was cemented by a feeling of mutual esteem characteristically displayed by an incident related as having occurred at the time. They were discussing the principles of art in relation to taste, when Barry, happening to quote from a recent treatise published anonymously, Burke affected to speak slightly of it. Barry warmly defended the conclusions of the anonymous writer, and a protracted discussion was beginning to develop a spirit of combative partisanship, when Burke closed the controversy by acknowledging that he himself was the author. It was the "Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful," with which Barry had been so struck that he had copied it from beginning to end, as he told Burke, with many expressions of delighted appreciation. The philosophic and penetrating mind of the statesman-litterateur at once discerned in the painter a kindred spirit, and doubtless saw, with a kind of prophetic insight, that a distinguished career was opening before the young aspirant after fame.

No capital in Europe, perhaps, could boast of a more brilliant and intellectual society than Dublin at this epoch; and admitted to the inner circle, of which Burke—then entering on that sphere of action in which he was destined to achieve the highest distinction as an orator, a philosopher and a statesman, and to command "the applause of listening sensates"—was the bright, particular star, the self-taught son of the southern coasting captain, the struggling young artist

who, without any of the adventitious aids that social position supplies, had overleaped the artificial barriers that conventionalism interposes, and made his way to the front solely by the aid of the great gifts with which God had endowed him, continued for the eight months that succeeded his arrival in the Irish metropolis to mingle in the social reunions where such men as Grattan, Flood, Burgh, Langrishe, Lucas, Charlemont and other illustrious wits, orators, statesmen and scholars whose names belong to Irish history were a frequent and familiar presence. In such a congenial atmosphere—in a society to which intellect, and not mere fashion, gave the tone—the nascent genius of Barry, which would have been dwarfed by provincialism and chilled or stunted by poverty and neglect, grew and expanded. But while his intellect was rapidly ripened and polished by association with men of high culture, his pencil was not likely to find sufficient employment, at least in the branch of art which he essayed, and, encouraged to seek a still wider field, he went to London in 1764 with Burke's brother Richard. There, sojourning occasionally with the Burkes and Reynolds, he enjoyed all the advantages that the best literary and artistic society of the English metropolis—a society more numerous, but not more brilliant than that which he had just quitted—afforded. Although he is only mentioned twice in Boswell's gossiping biography of the great lexicographer, it is safe to assume that he was often one of the set of wits and worthies who foregathered in the Mitre tavern and took part in the discursive table talk of the select coterie of which Dr. Johnson was the moving spirit and Burke and Goldsmith² the *decus et tutamen*.

In October, 1765, he proceeded, at the suggestion of Reynolds, to Italy to complete his art studies, Burke, Reynolds and the Marquis of Rockingham supplying him with funds, for as yet no prejudice or jealous rivalry on either side had arisen to transform Barry and Reynolds from friends into foes. A sojourn of ten months in Paris was chiefly spent in drawing from the life in the Academy of St. Luke and inditing in his letters to Burke sharp criticisms on academies in general and French artists in particular, foreshadowing that propensity to be captious and critical which, later carried to excess, was his bane. On the 7th of September, 1766, he set out for Rome, that Rome of art "when art was still religion." In a letter to his generous fellow-countryman and patron giving an account of his journey, in which he showed that he could be as graphic with his pen as with his pencil, he writes: "My friend Barret was exceedingly out in his notions of Savoy and the Alpine country. The drawings

² Goldsmith used to engage in art discussions with Barry, disputing the subtlest dogmas with the pugnacious painter.

he saw of them might be, as he said, bird's-eye views, but had he been here himself he would have made a very different work of it. He would have seen, as I did for about five days together, the most awfully and horridly grand, romantic and picturesque scenes that it is possible to conceive; he would say everything else was bauble and boys' play compared with them. All this tract down to Grenoble one sees the country Salvator Rosa formed himself upon. Nobody esteems Salvator more than I do, yet I must say he has not made half the use of it he might have done. The wild forms of his trees, rocks, etc. (for which he is condemned by some cold, spiritless artists whose notions reach no further than the artificial regular productions of their own climes), are infinitely short of the noble phrensy in which nature wantons all over those mountains; great pines of the most inconceivable diversity of forms—some straight as arrows, others crooked as a horn, some the roots uppermost—are hanging over frightful rocks and caves, and torrents of water rolling amongst them. . . . One thing, by the way, the people are just the species of figures for such a landscape; though I believe they may be as honest as they are said to be, yet every countenance has that ferocity and assassin look which Salvator Rosa has so truly, and so agreeably to the costume, introduced into his pictures." These art criticisms elicited the warm approbation of Sir Joshua Reynolds and were termed by Edmund Burke "admirable." Reynolds conceived high things of him and recommended him, above all, the continual study of the Cappella Sestina, adorned with the great works of Michael Angelo, and expressed a high opinion of a drawing of Alexander sent as a gift to Burke, which he thought "admirably drawn and with great spirit."

It were strange, indeed, if a mind like Barry's, in which the imaginative faculty predominated to an exceptional degree, surrounded by all, or most all, of sublime or beautiful that the brain had conceived or the hand executed, from the loftiest realized ideals of classical antiquity to the higher and more spiritualized conceptions of Christian art, had not taken the hue of its surroundings and drawn inspiration at a shrine at which men of all nations had long done homage to genius—genius purified and fostered by a religion that links elevation of thought to elevation of soul. Breathing, as it were, an atmosphere of art and elevated by the *afflatus* of the genius within and around him—genius in the abstract idealism of a mind teeming with artistic conceptions and genius in the concrete form of canvas that "glowed beyond even nature warm" and statuary that "filled the air around with beauty"—into a region of thought and aspiration far too lofty for the mediocre minds of some of those with whom he was brought in contact, and even for his own imperfectly devel-

oped powers of delineation. Imaginativeness was at once his strength and his weakness. His powers of conception surpassed his powers of execution; or, as Burke expresses it in one of his letters: "The extent and rapidity of your mind carries you to too great a diversity of things and to the completion of a whole before you are master of the parts." Besides, Rome at the time he studied there was to a great extent rather a market than a school of art; originality was repressed by false taste and false theories of art; *conoscenti*, best described in the words of Count Stroganoff³ as *amateurs sans amour et connoisseurs sans connoissance*, who could only chatter:

The paltry jargon of the marble mart,
Where Pedantry gulls Folly—

had established certain arbitrary canons of taste, to dissent from which would be an intellectual heresy; while picture dealers drove a flourishing trade in the manufacture of faked "old masters," to the detriment alike of art culture and commercial integrity.⁴ "The keenness of his observation and the uncompromising independence of his spirit," says an able and impartial writer, "refused from the first the petty trammels of spurious taste; his masculine reason spurned all theories built on error; he flung aside with mental scorn the degrading chain with which prating *conoscenti* and quack discoverers of old pictures had bound the public; but his genius, or the superiority of his reason, were assuredly not equaled by his discretion and temper. Unhappily for him, he opposed fraud and prejudice with the zeal of fanaticism; in the ardor of conviction and in his eagerness to vindicate the great truths of art he omitted to see that he was crossing the interests and wounding the pride of those who surrounded him. His canons of taste could not be assented to; and his reasonings, not convenient to answer, were, of course, for the most part evaded by all the various little provoking resources so

³ President of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg.

⁴ Another distinguished Irish artist, Sir Martin Archer Shee, one of the presidents of the Royal Academy, in the preface to his "Rhymes on Art" (1805), says: "The superior wealth of this country and the almost incredible prices paid here for some celebrated collections, set in motion the trading tribes of taste in every corner of Europe. A general rummage took place for our gratification: all the manufacturers of 'originals'—the coiners of antiques—the dryers, smokers and stainers of the Worshipful Company of Ciceroni, were put in requisition to supply the voracity of our appetite. All rushed eagerly with their commodities to so profitable a market, and he was a more than unlucky traveler who could not turn his tour to account and pick up a Titan or a Corregio on his road. Thus has the nation been glutted with pictures of every description, from the best that genius can boast to the worst that fraud can manufacture, until all the wealth of individuals disposable for the objects of virtù has been diverted into channels from which our native arts can derive no advantage."

well known to cliques and coteries who have the game in their own hands. Poor Barry, by nature self-confident and irritable, was soon stung into a fever of indignation; and here, for the first time, seems to have been developed in his constitution the fatal seed of all the misfortunes of his after life."

It having come to his knowledge that his *protégé* was at variance with the artists and *virtuosi* of Rome, Burke wrote him a long letter full of words of wise counsel, in which candor and kindness were happily blended by one who was too honest to flatter, too feeling to condemn. "I had a thousand times rather you should fix your residence in Rome than here," he wrote, "as I should not then have the mortification of seeing with my own eyes a genius of the first rank lost to the world, himself and his friends, as I certainly must if you do not assume a manner of acting and thinking here totally different from what your letters from Rome have described to me. That you have had just subjects of indignation always, and anger often, I do no ways doubt—who can live in the world without some trial of his patience?—but, believe me, my dear Barry, that the arms with which the ill dispositions of the world are to be combated, and the qualities by which it is to be reconciled to us, and we reconciled to it, are moderation, gentleness, a little indulgence to others and a great distrust of ourselves, which are not qualities of a mean spirit, as some may possibly think them, but virtues of a great and noble kind, and such as dignify our nature as much as they contribute to our repose and fortune; for nothing can be so unworthy of a well composed soul as to pass away life in bickerings and litigations, in snarling and scuffling with every one about us. Again and again, dear Barry, we must be at peace with out species; if not for their sakes, yet very much for our own." And, having foreshadowed with prophetic foresight the inevitable consequences of these faults of character, he proceeds: "Remember we are born to serve and adorn our country, and not to contend with our fellow-citizens, and that in particular your business is to paint and not to dispute. . . . Do everything that may contribute to your improvement, and I shall rejoice to see you, what Providence intended you, a very great man. This you were, in your *ideas*, before you quitted. You best know how far you have studied, that is practised the mechanic, despised nothing till you had tried it, practised dissections with your own hands, painted from nature as well as from the statues, and portrait as well as history, and this frequently. If you have done all this, as I trust you have, you want nothing but a little prudence to fulfill all our wishes."

Barry hastened to reply to assure Burke that he had made the most of his time and labored to some purpose. "My vanity," he says,

"will offer you the proof of my assertion by the great pains that people have been at to hide me, even when they knew how perilous the attempt might be to their own characters." He formed his style principally upon the works of Raffaele in the Vatican, Angelo's marvelous creations in the Sistine, in which the great Florentine seems to have invested the human form with attributes of grandeur and beauty almost superhuman, and Titian, his favorite master, the splendor and glow of whose matchless coloring reflect the rich hues of an Italian sunset. But it has been observed that "though the course of study he pursued was one of the most intense and laborious assiduity, it was rather directed towards the acquisition of critical knowledge than for improvement in the mechanical resources of his profession; that he wasted too much on the study of forms and proportions that diligence which was wanting to obtain the mastery of colors, and too much neglected that study of *effects* as they exist in nature—the great source from which the masters of every school must attain the perfection of art."

It is with Barry's sojourn in Rome that another Corkagian, like himself endowed with more wit than wisdom, Frank Mahony, in that farrago of facetious fables, of facts and fancies, "The Reliques of Father Prout," associates an imaginary meeting in the Piazza del Popolo between the artist and "the lone incumbent of Watergrass-hill," who is made to describe the former as "a wild fellow" who had "a sort of confiding fondness" for him, "owing," he says, "no doubt to our being both natives of Cork, or at least citizens thereof." "What was my precise current of cogitation I cannot remember," relates Father Prout, or rather Father Mahony in his pseudonymic personality, "but I was suddenly aroused from my reverie by the rough grasp of honest and affectionate welcome; mine eye gazed on the well-known countenance of James Barry. Then and there was I destined to meet thee, best beloved of my boyhood and earliest associate of my school days, with whom I had often played the traunt from the hedge academy of Tim Delany.

Morum prime sodalium!
Cum quo morantem sæpe diem
Fregi.⁵

Then and there was it my lot to encounter him whom I had remembered a shoeless, stockingless and reckless urchin, yet withal the life and fun in the classic purlieus of Blarney lane; ripe for every mischief, but distinguished among all the pupils of our excellent Didaculus by the graphic accuracy with which his embryo genius could trace in chalk on the school door or with slate pencil on those tablets sacred to Euclid, the pedant's bespectacled proboscis. A red cow in

⁵ Horace, lib ii., ode 7.

fresco over Mick Flannagan's public house still exists to attest the early development of his pictorial talent; even then his passion for the fine arts was demonstrated by the fact of his having removed in the dead of night to his own garret the wooden effigy of a blackamoor that adorned the widow Brady's tobacco shop. I afterwards lost sight of him when he migrated from Cork to the miserable hamlet of passage on the harbor. His father, who had been a builder while in town, became, it appears, the owner of a small coasting craft, in which, sadly against his inclination, my poor James was doomed to roam the blue deep until he at last rebelled against his maritime destiny, and, 'taking up arms against a sea of troubles,' determined, in opposition to parental authority, at once to 'end them.' Then Prout goes on to tell of Barry's wonderment at discovering his quondam acquaintance in a semi-ecclesiastical garb; how they adjourned to the Osteria della Sybilla in the Corso, and how Barry, with "the swelling tear of joyous enthusiasm in the full eye of kindling genius," drank the health of Edmund Burke, "his noble, his generous protector!" They parted at a late hour, Barry crossing the street to his modest *stanzina* in the Vicolo del Greco, and Prout to the cave of the Sybil to "dream over many a frolic of bygone days, over many a deed of Roman heroism; commingling the recollections of Tim Delany with those of Michael Angelo, and alternately perambulating in spirit the Via Sacra and Blarney lane." Barry, who, according to Prout, "retained in the maturity of manhood that accompaniment of inborn genius—the heart of childhood still fresh and warm in his breast," is made to indulge his sportive spirit at the expense of the priest; while a halo of romance is shed over the scene when the painter is depicted as falling in love with Marcella, the pretty daughter of Fabio Centurioni (the senior officer of the Vatican Gallery, who tenanted the Tarrione dei Venti at the extreme end of the palace), and who returned the affection of "the wild Irish artist." The romantic gives place to the melodramatic—or should it be said the farcical?—when Barry, who is said to have loved to study in the Vatican Gallery by night unobserved—safe from the jealously watchful eyes of the English artists in Rome, to whom he is credited with attributing a design "to appropriate the conceptions of his teeming fancy and to rob him of his originality"—suddenly pounces on an ecclesiastic, whom he mistakes for Nollekens playing the eaves-dropper, and who, to his dismay, turns out to be the Pope! *Risum teneatis*, etc.

If Barry was not caught napping in the Vatican or had any such midnight adventure as Prout evolved from his sportive imagination, he caught a chill there which developed into a fever. "Nothing could have made me more really happy," he wrote to Reynolds, "than

your very kind letter. It came most opportunely to support my spirits at a time when I was ill of a fever, which I believed was occasioned by a cold while working in the Vatican."

It is a pleasing relief to turn aside from the record of Barry's encounter with the small wits of the Roman studios, whom he fought single-handed, to a private letter to his father and mother, dated November 8, 1769, in which he reveals himself to us in the more attractive aspect of a fond relative in whom the absorbing pursuit of fame and familiar intercourse with men of high standing like Burke and Reynolds had neither impaired natural affection nor extinguished gratitude. He has been distressed at learning of the death of his brother John, who was qualifying as an architect, and is painfully anxious for further tidings from home. But he is somewhat reassured "in seeing that excellent man, Dr. Sleigh, interest himself about my father and family. Good God!" he pursues, "in how many singular and unthought-of ways has the goodness of that gentleman exerted itself towards me! He first put me upon Mr. Burke, who has, under God, been all in all to me; next he had desires of strengthening my connexion with Mr. Stewart, which is the only construction I could make of the friendly letter which I received from him in London; and afterwards he is for administering comfort to my poor parents. I shall, then, with the blessing of God, be in England about May next; and I hope there is no need for me to mention to one of my father's experience in the world how necessary it is to be armed with patience and resignation against those unavoidable strokes of mortality to which the world is subject. As we advance in life we must quit our hold of one thing after another; and, since we cannot help it, and that it is a necessary condition of our existence that ourselves and everything connected with us shall be swallowed up in the mass of changes and renovations which we see every day in the world, let us endeavour not to embitter the little of life that is before us with a too frequent calling to mind of past troubles and misfortunes; and, if ever God Almighty is pleased to crown my very severe and intense application to my studies with any degree of success in the world, I am sure the greatest pleasure that will arise to me from it will be the consolation it will give my dear father, mother and friends." Shortly afterwards the news of Dr. Sleigh's death reached him, and in April, 1770, he bade adieu to the Eternal City, stopping en route at Bologna to receive the diploma of the Clementine Academy, a distinction conferred in recognition of his already conspicuous merit, and to paint for his reception picture "*Philoctetes in the Isle of Lemnos*," a subject suggested by one of Sophocles' dramas.

When Barry returned to England the nation was only just after

emerging from the intellectual penumbra under which the latent artistic genius of the people had been partially eclipsed by the swarm of foreign artists, great and small, who, basking in the beams of royal patronage, had made London their happy hunting ground from the time of Henry VIII. downwards; until Hogarth, Reynolds, Barry, West, Wilson and Gainsborough rescued the country from the discredit of having no distinct school of its own.⁶

"The genius of Reynolds," Fuseli says, "was the first to rescue from the mannered depravation of foreigners his own branch;" but to James Barry undoubtedly belongs the chief merit, in the highest walk of art, of successfully disproving the assertions of Winklemann, Du Bos, Montesquieu and others that the British mind, owing to the adverse conditions under which it attained its development—its æsthetic qualities being impaired or altogether extinguished by certain peculiarities of race and climate—possessed no inherent adaptability to such pursuits; entering with characteristic warmth into the controversy and displaying a knowledge of history as profound and accurate as his knowledge of art.⁷ "Barry's life," says a very judicious critic, "was a dream of the imaginary splendors of a restoration of ancient art; his spirit teemed with visions of the graces of Raffaele and the sublimities of Michael Angelo from the hands of British artists; and, in the impulse which England had now received, he dimly saw a day of glorious success, for which life would be, in his estimation, a light sacrifice." He aimed high; anything below this objective he disdained. "Rubens, Rembrandt, Vandyke, Teniers and Schalken," he wrote, "are without the pale of my Church; and though I will not condemn them, yet I must hold no intercourse with them."

Seized with this idea he produced, the year following his return to London, two fine classical compositions, "The Birth of Venus"

⁶ The Royal Academy was not established until Reynolds had reached the zenith of his fame. A private academy, with Sir G. Kneller as president, had been opened in 1711, but it split up into two or three rival bodies, which subsequently, at the instance of Hogarth, were re-united and became known as "the academy in St. Martin's lane." The proposal to establish an academy such as exists at present originated with Sir James Thornhill, but was not carried into effect until December 10, 1768, when the original society, chartered in 1765, was incorporated under royal patronage, although there were not as many artists as were required to constitute an academy. The first exhibition was held in a large auction room in Pall Mall, in May, 1769.

⁷ See his "Enquiry Into the Real and Imaginary Obstructions to the Acquisition of the Arts in England," published in 1775. "The sagacious reveries of Du Bos and Winklemann on this subject," writes Sir M. A. Shee, "have been ably exposed by Barry in his spirited defense of English (*sic*) genius. He has indeed combated those philosophical speculators in climate with two-fold powers. He has employed his pen and his pencil with equal ability, and not only foiled them in argument, but confounded them in fact."

and "Jupiter and Juno"—the latter founded on the incident in the Iliad that gave Phidias the *idée germe* of his statue of Jupiter. But the latter failed to hit the taste of the town, not from any lack of merit, but because the public were not as yet educated up to the point of appreciating works of such a high and original character. "The heathen gods on Barry's canvas," says Cunningham, "appealed to no popular sympathy—to no national belief—to no living superstition; the mob marveled what they meant, and the learned had little to say." His next effort, "The Death of Wolfe," was even less successful; for, enamored of "the grand style," of which Reynolds was the theoretical exponent, he discarded the vulgar, unclassical costume of modern times and represented the hero of Quebec and his companions-in-arms *in puris naturalibus*, an anachronism that overstepped the fine line that sometimes divides the sublime from the ridiculous.

About this time he also painted two companion cabinet pictures, "Mercury Inventing the Lyre" and "Narcissus," and saw, or fancied he saw, an opportunity of giving visible form and substance to his loftier and more cherished imaginings when he, Reynolds and other leading artists, believing that one of the noblest functions of art was the moral as well as intellectual elevation of mankind, proposed to gratuitously embellish St. Paul's Cathedral with Scriptural paintings. The idea originated with Barry, and was first mooted by him shortly after he was elected an Academician (1773), and it had everything in it to awaken the warmest enthusiasm and call forth his finest powers. The consent of the dean and chapter was readily obtained, and Barry,⁸ Cipriani, Angelica, Kauffman, Dance, Reynolds and West chosen by the Academy for the execution of this great undertaking, when the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London interfered and the project was abandoned. Barry's idea in this instance was as much an anachronism as his treatment of the death of Wolfe; he had mistaken an age of rationalism and utilitarianism for the ages of faith. The idea, however, was not destined to die, but to live, and, embodied in another form, to preserve the name of James Barry from oblivion. *Non omnis moriar*, said the Latin poet, and as long as the famous Adelphi pictures shall last the memory of their painter will not be forgotten.

When, in 1774, the Society of Arts was about to move into its new house in the Adelphi, it was decided to decorate the great room in which they held their meetings with eight historical and two allegorical pictures, the artists to receive in payment the profits arising from an exhibition of their work. The historical painters were the

⁸ Barry was to have painted the Jews' rejection of Christ when Pilate proposed his release.

six who had offered to decorate St. Paul's, with the addition of Mortimer and Wright; the allegorical painters, Romney and Penny. The response to the proposal—mainly, it appears, owing to Sir Joshua Reynolds—was a refusal. Three years afterwards, in 1777, had it conveyed to the society that one of the Royal Academicians was willing to take the whole work upon himself. The offer, first made anonymously, was accepted by the society before the name of the artist was revealed by the chairman producing his letter. "Barry," says Mr. Trueman Wood,⁹ "was then young and little known,¹⁰ full of confidence in his own powers and assured that nothing was wanting for him to make a reputation. Nor were his objects wholly personal. He was impressed—as well he might be—with the degraded condition of English art, 'fitted for nothing greater than portraits and other low matters from whence no honor could be derived either to the artist or to the country,'¹¹ and he believed that the production of 'some great work of historical painting' would refute the assertions of those foreign critics who declared English painters to be incapable of any permanent work, and would also serve as an example to his countrymen. Feeling at once the necessity of the work and the capacity within himself for executing it, he set himself to do it without, as it seems, considering or caring even how he was to live during all the years so long a task must occupy." It is characteristic of the man and his enthusiastic and unselfish devotion to art, and the great idea on which his mind was bent, that at the moment he imposed on himself this unpaid or underpaid labor of love he had no settled income, supported himself as best he could by etching, and had only sixteen shillings in his pocket! "He applied to patrons, principally members of the society, for a loan to assist him while he was at work, but it does not appear whether his applications were successful."¹²

The whole series of pictures was intended "to illustrate this great maxim or moral truth, viz.: that the obtaining happiness, as well individual as public, depends on cultivating the human faculties. To prove the truth of this doctrine, the first picture exhibits mankind in its savage or uncivilized condition, represented by people

⁹ "A Note on the Pictures by James Barry in the Great Room of the Society of Arts," by H. Trueman Wood, secretary to the society, London, 1880.

¹⁰ The writer, it is to be presumed, means little known outside art circles. Within them he was already sufficiently well known to be elected an Academician.

¹¹ "An Account of a Series of Pictures in the Great Room of the Society of Arts," by James Barry, R. A., professor of painting to the Royal Academy, London. Printed for the author by William Adlard, printer to the society. 1783. Introduction.

¹² H. Trueman Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

inhabiting a wild and desert country, while Orpheus is explaining to them the advantages of culture; the second, "A Grecian Harvest Home," symbolizing agricultural development; the third, "The Victors at Olympia," typifying advanced culture; the fourth, "Navigation; or, The Triumph of the Thames," emblematical of the progress of modern commerce; the fifth, the rewards of culture illustrated by the society's distribution of its prizes, and the sixth, "Elysium; or, The State of Final Retribution," in which are grouped great and good men of all ages and nations who have acted as the cultivators of mankind. Much as Barry contemned mere portraiture or, as he termed it, "the wretched business of face painting," he introduces several portraits, including one of himself,¹³ into his great pictures.

Begun in 1777, the series of paintings was finished in 1783. Two exhibitions, one held in 1783 and another in 1784, the former being attended by 6,441 persons and the latter by 3,511, realized £503 12s. for the benefit of the artist, who was the recipient of numerous congratulations, accompanied in some instances by subscriptions or orders for paintings. Among the visitors was Jonas Hanway—the introducer of umbrellas—who was so pleased with the pictures that he showed his gratification in a practical way by changing the shilling he had paid for admission for a guinea as he left. "The exhibition," says a centenary memoir in the *Journal of the Society of Arts*,¹⁴ "was an important event in London life and is recorded by most of the memoir writers of the time; in fact, it was the talk of the town. Horace Walpole was greatly struck with the picture of the 'Olympic Victors,' the figures in which, he says, 'are fairly drawn and graceful, and the whole composition is simple and classic.'" Of the same picture Canova when in England declared that had he known such a work existed he would, without any other motive, have journeyed from Italy to see it. Boswell records Dr. Johnson as saying: "Whatever the hand may have done, the mind has done its part. There is a grasp of mind there which you will find nowhere else." "Those who have examined these extraordinary works," says Cunningham, "will hardly dispute that the artist grappled with a subject too varied, complicated and profound for the pencil. The moral grandeur of the undertaking and the historical associations which it awakened, together with the room which it afforded for the display of imagination, imposed upon the ardent and indiscriminating Barry; and he probably begun with desperate charcoal round the darkening walls of the Adelphi in the belief that the subject would unfold and brighten upon him by degrees; but the sunrise of knowledge and the

¹³ The figure of Timanthes seated at the base of the statue of Hercules in "The Victors of Olympia" represents Barry himself at the age of forty-two. This was engraved by Heath (front. vol. III., *Society's Transactions*).

¹⁴ No. 2,781, vol. LIV., March 9, 1906.

full day of art and science involved discoveries and inventions which painting could not well find shape nor color to express. The fault of the work lies in the subject: he that runs cannot read, and he who reads cannot always understand. The description of Barry's own pen opens the secret somewhat; without it those six pictures, instead of presenting one continued story, simple in conception and unembarrassed in detail, would appear like so many splendid riddles."

They attracted much and deserved attention and greatly enhanced the reputation of the painter, who made various additions to them almost up to the date of his death. Edmund Burke, who is credited some share in the work, as he was consulted as to the most appropriate class of subjects for treatment, expressed his admiration of the pictures, of which he anonymously wrote an account quoted by Croly in his "Life of Burke" (1840). "Eager crowds," says a writer¹⁵ rather prejudiced against the artist, "asserted that Barry's incomparable genius would now at length be acknowledged. And, indeed, there was something very noble in the manner this uncouth, ignorant¹⁶ and passionate man had worked. Nothing could daunt him, nothing make him alter his style by a hair's breadth. He might have acquired a fortune as a portrait painter, but he would be content with nothing less than the 'grand style.' History or allegory, treated with the most rigid classicism, was all he would attempt. So for years he goes on, neglected by the public, often with scarcely enough to keep body and soul together, but never relaxing his efforts, never swerving from his determination. And now he has his reward."

After two exhibitions the pictures lost the charm of novelty and public interest in them flagged. He chafed against this, and in a letter dated October, 1784, to the society he complained bitterly of this want of taste on the part of the public. Sixteen or eighteen thousand pounds had, he says, been squandered that year at Westminster upon a "jubilee of hackney'd German music—an empty hubbub of hundreds of fiddles and drums, which was dissipated in the air as soon as performed." While this musical performance drew "people of the first rank and condition" in crowds, his pictures, which were to have revolutionized English art, were being neglected in the Adelphi.

In 1798-1799 a gold medal and two hundred guineas were awarded to him "in testimony of his public zeal and eminent abilities manifested in the series of pictures in the Great Room of the Society."

¹⁵ "Sir Joshua Reynolds" (Great Artists series), by F. S. Pulling, M. A., Exeter College, Oxford. London: Sampson Low, 1886.

¹⁶ The writer is not warranted in applying such an epithet to Barry, who was highly intellectual, well read and could handle his pen as well as his pencil with equal ability.

The original design did not include pictures for the spaces over the chimney pieces at either end filled with portraits of Lord Romney and Folkestone, but in 1801 he offered to execute paintings, free of cost to the society, to take the place of these portraits. Although the proposal was at first readily accepted, it seems to have given rise to some difference of opinion, for the then president, the Duke of Norfolk, notified his intention of moving to rescind the resolution of the society for the removal of the portraits. Under these circumstances Barry at once withdrew his offer. On the death of Nelson the society proposed to commemorate the victor of Trafalgar in one of the pictures, and Barry had undertaken to execute the work, but he died before he could even begin it.¹⁷

The Adelphi pictures are, in truth, a splendid fragment of a design vast in its scope. The amplitude of the canvas harmonized with the amplitude of the subject, for each picture is eleven feet ten inches high; four of them being fifteen feet two inches, and the others forty-two feet broad; which elicited a long letter from an anonymous critic, in which the writer combated the fallacy that confounds size with sublimity. It is much to be regretted that they are not hung in a better light and in a more public place, where they would be accessible to the frequenters of picture galleries. As it is, they are all but lost to the nation that is fortunate in possessing them. Thousands upon thousands from year's end to year's end traverse one of the great London thoroughfares and never suspect that a most valuable art treasure is hidden away from public gaze in an unfrequented by-street a few paces from the Strand. Were one of the suite of rooms in Trafalgar Square or South Kensington allocated to them, ninety out of every hundred of the British public would

¹⁷ Besides the pictures in the Great Room, the society possesses the plates of a number of etchings by Barry, six representing the six pictures, but differing in many of the details from the paintings. The other etchings are nearly all from pictures of the artist, most of which are no longer extant. The society also possesses Barry's "Adam and Eve," one of his more important works, which he brought with him from Rome and finished in London; a portrait of Barry in middle age, painted by himself, as well as a pen-and-ink drawing made a few years before his death and a portrait of his mother. Of the drawing, subsequently etched by him, Charles Warren, the engraver, who bought it at the sale of Barry's effects, wrote: "I can answer for its being a strong characteristic likeness of that eminent artist and singular man." In addition to these are two portraits of the artist in the National Portrait Gallery, one by himself as a young man and a drawing in Italian chalk by William Evans from a cast taken late in life. There is another by himself at the Victoria and Albert Museum (Parsons bequest), where also hangs his "Adam and Eve." When his works were sold at Christie's, in 1807, they fetched very high prices, the "Adam and Eve" being purchased for 100 guineas. One of them, however, the "Pandora," which brought, unfinished, 230 guineas when resold in 1846 to pay the expense of warehouse room, only fetched 11½ guineas.

no longer bein ignorance of their existence, and the knowledge that London galleries afford of the growth and advancement of one of the leading schools of art in Europe would be materially increased.

Meanwhile Barry's querulous disposition and combative character had estranged him from many of his brother artists. He had been waging a critical war *à outrance* with Reynolds¹⁸ and the Academicians and aroused a spirit of hostility which pursued him to the bitter end. Even his guide, philosopher and friend, Edmund Burke, leaning more to the side of prudence than friendship, avoided him, preferring to maintain an attitude of neutrality, since, as Cunningham says, "to continue on intimate terms with one so fierce of nature, it was necessary to become his partisan, and like being second in a duel of old, when both principals and seconds drew their swords and fought the quarrel out." Barry, however, was not vindictive, and he frequently entered again into friendly relations with those he had previously treated as enemies. Fanny Burney said of him: "His passions had no restraint, though I think extremely well of his heart as well as of his understanding." His dispute with Reynolds was amicably arranged before the latter died, and, having sided with Sir Joshua in his contest with the Academy, he delivered an eloquent eulogium of the departed president as a man and an artist.¹⁹

Having been elected a Royal Academician in 1773, on the death of Mr. Penny in 1782 he was appointed professor of painting to the Academy. And here occurs one of the most regrettable episodes in his career. An uncompromising opponent of some of the prevalent views on art, he used the position conferred on him in recognition of his great attainments in the theoretical and critical departments of art quite as much to censure his fellow-academicians as to instruct the students. How far that censure was justifiable or otherwise

¹⁸ When the Marchioness of Thomond (then Lord and Lady Inchiquin) presented him, in 1794, with Reynolds' painting chair, he wrote: "This chair that has had such a glorious career of fortune, instrumental as it has been in giving the most advantageous stability to the otherwise fleeting, perishable graces of a Lady Sarah Bunbury or a Waldegrave, or in perpetuating the negligent, honest exterior of the authors of 'The Rambler' and 'The Traveler,' and almost every one to whom the public admiration gave a currency for abilities, beauty, rank or fashion. The very chair that is immortalized in Mrs. Siddons' tragic muse . . . may rest very well satisfied with the reputation it has gained; and although its present possessor may not be enabled to grace it with any new ornament, yet it can surely count upon finding a most affectionate, reverential conservator whilst God shall permit it to remain under his care."

¹⁹ Prevented by the absorbing nature of his other occupations from preparing the lectures in time, the president, at one of the sittings of the Academy, drew attention to the delay in a manner which brought Barry promptly to his feet. "If I had no more to do in the course of my lectures," he answered excitedly, "than produce such poor, mistaken stuff as your discourses, I should soon have them ready for reading."

would open up a subject quite pertinent to the theme, but far too intricate and technical to treat fully and fairly within the limits of a biographical sketch. His lectures, begun in March, 1784, attracted a numerous attendance and were mainly devoted to the advocacy of the great aim he kept steadily in view throughout his life, namely, the superiority of the historical over every other branch of art. They are characterized by a broad and firm grasp of his subject, abound in great wealth of illustration and possess literary merits of an order that would justify the application to Barry of the eulogium Charles Dickens passed on the late Mr. Maclise—that, had he so willed it, he would have been as great a writer as he was a painter. Although tarnished by a tone of acerbity and personality,²⁰ they were subsequently adopted by the Royal Academy as one of the class books to be used by the students, and still hold their place among standard works of art.

His antagonism to some members of the Academy wrecked and ruined him. The contest, which he pursued regardless of personal consequences, culminated on April 15, 1799, in his removal from his professor's chair and expulsion from the Academy upon charges he was denied an opportunity of repelling—this harsh and undignified proceeding receiving the King's confirmation. Whatever may have been his faults—however irritable his temper or biased his judgment—the conduct of the Academy may be palliated, but not defended. Stung by his repeated reproaches²¹ into a spirit of vindictive resentment, they arraigned, judged and sentenced him without permitting him to utter a word in his defense, ignoring alike what was due to their own dignity as a corporate body and the commonest principles of justice.

Thus rudely thrust outside the pale of a profession he elevated and adorned, he retired to his cheerless abode in Cosble street, near Oxford street, to end his days in obscurity, indigence and neglect, fulfilling to the letter Burke's prophecy that he would "go out of the world fretted, disappointed and ruined."

Careless of his attire and scornfully indifferent to the usages of a society from which he was self-ostracized, he had been living the life of an anchorite in a dilapidated house in the vicinity of Oxford Market, dining off delph, on which his dinner was sent him from a cook shop in Wardour street, his breakfast being supplied from a public house where that meal was prepared at an early hour for

²⁰ In his "Letter to the Dilettanti Society" he assailed the actual conduct of the Academy's affairs; denounced private combinations and jealousies; asserted that the funds were dissipated by secret intrigues, and proposed that whenever the judgment of the body was appealed to the honest vote of each member should be secured by oath.—Vide Cunningham.

²¹ Sir Robert Peel, who profited by the sale of the annuity, gave £200 to pay for his funeral and to raise a tablet to his memory.

bricklayers or laborers of any kind at three pence per head, brooding all the while in misanthropic indignation over his real or fancied wrongs. He lived, it is said, chiefly on bread and apples and earned a very scanty income by etching for the print shops and supplying cuts and decorations for the commonest sort of books. A morbid imagination that "made the meat it fed upon" had filled his mind with haunting suspicions of conspiracies and cabals, and, fearing to be either poisoned or poniarded, he had become distrustful of even the solitary attendant, an old Cork woman who used to wait on him at his former lodgings in St. Martin's lane; and with one room for kitchen, parlor and studio, in which culinary utensils and art appliances were huddled together "in most admired disorder," he lived in utter loneliness, cooking and performing every menial office for himself. "He wore at that time," writes Southey, "an old coat of green baize, but from which time had taken all the green that incrustations of paint and dirt had not covered. His wig was one which you might suppose he had borrowed from a scarecrow; all round it projected a fringe of his own gray hair. He lived alone in a house which was never cleaned, and he slept on a bedstead with no other furniture than a blanket nailed on one side." "His last years," says the writer in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* already quoted, "were spent in poverty and seclusion, but he did nothing to forfeit the respect of his fellow-men. He rather starved than borrowed from his friends."

The sum realized by the exhibitions at the Society of Arts was stolen by housebreakers, and he was indebted to the Earl of Radnor and two gentlemen named Holles for the amount of his loss, which they generously made up between them. He began, but owing to the want of means was unable to complete, a series of pictures on the progress of theology. At length, through the instrumentality of the Earl of Buchan, a subscription amounting to a thousand pounds was raised and an annuity of £120 purchased from Sir Robert Pell.²² But it was too late. The hand of death was on him, although one saw it not. Mental labor and mental anxiety, which for years had been slowly undermining his constitution, had done their fatal work. The delicate fibrous structure of a nervous system constantly overwrought could no longer endure the strain; and the heart which, if quick to resent ill-treatment was as prompt to thrill responsive to the voice of friendship, soon ceased to beat forever.

The closing scene in this life drama, full of passion and pathos, is thus graphically described by one of his most intimate friends: "On the evening of Thursday, February 6, 1806, he was seized, as he entered the house where he usually dined,²³ with the cold fit of a pleuritic fever of so intense a degree that all his faculties were sus-

pended and he was unable to articulate or move. Some cordial was administered to him, and on coming a little to himself he was taken in a coach to the door of his house, which, the keyhole being plugged with dirt and pebbles, as had been often done before by the malice or perhaps the roguery of boys in the neighborhood, it was found impossible to open. The night being dark and he shivering under the progress of his disease, his friends thought it advisable to drive away without loss of time to the hospitable mansion of Mr. Bonomi. By the kindness of that good family a bed was procured in a neighboring house, to which he was immediately conveyed. Here he desired to be left and locked himself up, unfortunately, for forty hours, without the least medical assistance. What took place in the meantime he could give but little account of, as he represented himself to be delirious and only recollected his being tortured with a burning pain in his side and with difficulty of breathing. In this short time was the deathblow given, which by the prompt and timely aid of copious bleeding might have been averted; but such had been the reaction of the hot fit succeeding the rigors and the violence of the inflammation on the pleura that an effusion of lymph had taken place, as appeared afterwards upon dissection. In the afternoon of Saturday, February 8, he arose and crawled forth to relate his complaint to the writer of this account. He was pale, breathless and tottering as he entered the room, with a dull pain in his side, a cough, short and incessant, and a pulse quick and feeble. Succeeding remedies proved of little avail. With exacerbations and remissions of fever he lingered to the 22d of February, when he expired."

His antagonists in the Academy carried their resentment so far as to refuse to permit his remains to lie in state in their rooms, and gratified their mean malevolence in allowing him "to be borne to the grave by hands that had never touched a pencil." "The conduct of the Academy," says Cunningham, "was no doubt conformable to etiquette; but Barry, though he had sinned against their rules, had done nothing to lower him in the general estimation of mankind. He might be, in their eyes, a degraded Academician—no one could call him a degraded artist; and the remains of a man of genius had surely a claim to some concession at their hands." They were removed to the Society of Arts²⁴ and lay in the room he had toiled

²² An eating house, near Castle street, Oxford street.

²³ The following are the words of the resolution passed by a unanimous vote by the society on the occasion of his death: "That permission should be given to the persons conducting the funeral of the late Mr. Barry to place his body in the Great Room of the society the night previous to his interment, as the last tribute in the power of the society to offer to the remains of the illustrious artist, to whose labors it is indebted for the series of classical paintings which adorn its walls."

with head and hand to make a shrine of genius whither votaries should come in after years to pay the tardy tribute of posthumous praise to his memory—now the scene of barren honors as it had been of a triumph all but barren—until they were borne to St. Paul's to be laid by the side of Reynolds in the crypt where the earthly remains of earthly greatness point a moral whose wide import grasps the present and the future and reaches beyond the tomb.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR.

WHEN the poets of antiquity wish to depict the simplicity of primitive times they speak of mounds of turf, *gramineae area*, or blocks of stone as the altars whereon in the earliest ages men deposited the votive offerings they made to the Deity. The first instance of the use of the word altar in Holy Scripture is when Noe built an altar unto the Lord and offered an holocaust in thanksgiving for the cessation of the deluge. Abram likewise raised an altar at Sichem, Isaac at Bersabee, Jacob at Salem, Moses after the victory over Amalec, Samuel at Ramatha, Saul after the decisive defeat of the Philistines. It is recorded that David purchased a site on which to build an altar and offer sacrifices of propitiation to stay the plague raging among his subjects after he had numbered them.

Not only the nature of the sacrifices, but also the material and construction of the Old Testament altars was divinely prescribed. God commanded Moses to make an altar of earth unto Him, or if of stone, not to build it of hewn stones. The altars of Baal were in groves. This was strictly prohibited to the Jews: "Thou shalt plant no grove nor any tree near the altar of the Lord thy God." (Deut. xvi., 21.) Gedeon was instructed to raise an altar on the summit of a rock; Elias built an altar composed of twelve stones on Mount Carmel. In Solomon's temple an altar of cedar wood plated with gold stood before the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies for incense; others made of setim wood overlaid with brass were used for burnt offerings; these were not solid, but hollow inside like a chest. The early form of the altar was square, with a cavity or depression in the centre for fire, or for the libations of water or wine. The Greeks and Romans erected altars in public places; thus it was that St. Paul saw at Athens the one dedicated

to the unknown God. The *ara masima* of the Romans was dedicated to Hercules and asserted to have been constructed by him.

The terms *ara*, *altare* were at first distasteful to Christians on account of heathen associations. Hence in the writings of the Latin Fathers use is made of the word *menso* (a table whereat to eat and drink) to designate the table or raised surface whereon the Holy Eucharist is celebrated. In order to avoid the profane sense they attached to it a distinguishing predicate: *mensa sacra, mystica, divinia, coelestis*, etc.; the word *thusiasterion*, from the Greek sacrifice, was also employed. As the Christians naturally shrank from disclosing to the heathen details of their worship, their enemies used to taunt them with having neither temples nor altars. *Cur nullas aras habent?* was often asked reproachfully. *Ara* is frequently applied by Tertullian to the Christian altar, though not without qualification: *ara Dei, ara Domini*. In rubrics *ara* designates a portable altar or stone slab. By far the most common designation in liturgical diction is *altare*, a high or raised altar, from *altus* (*alta-ara*). *Altarium* is used by later writers; the canons of the Council of Anserre decree that Mass is not to be said more than once a day *super uno altario*. In most European languages the word in use for the Lord's table is derived with slight change from *altare*; in Russia, however, *prestos*, properly a throne, is employed.

The Levitical altar, as has been said, was four square; the Christian altar was somewhat longer than broad, owing probably to the custom of the church of the catacombs of offering the divine mysteries over the place where the martyrs were interred. These *arcosolia* were excavations about three feet from the floor of the oratory, in the tufa forming the walls of the catacombs, large enough to receive one or more bodies, covered with a slab of marble and surmounted by an arch. These altars frequently bore the name of the martyrs in whose honor they were raised. St. Augustine (sermo 310) speaks of *mensa Cypriani*; hence in the first centuries it was necessary to guard against the danger of regarding the Mass as a sacrifice or libation offered to martyrs resting under the altar: "Them that were slain for the Word of God and the testimony that they held." (Apoc. vi., 9.) Nor was it only in Rome that altars and memorials of martyrs were strictly associated. The custom of celebrating Mass above the spot where their remains were interred probably arose from the disposition to look on the sufferings of confessors of the faith as analogous with the sacrifice of Christ commemorated and perpetuated in the Holy Eucharist, and gave rise to the long-established rule that the altar must contain relics of some saint. This occasioned a change of material as well as of form. The earliest altars were tables of wood. In the high altar

of St. John Lateran in Rome, at which the Pope alone may say Mass, is a portable altar, the top and sides of wooden planks, used by St. Peter in the house of Pudens, and for his daily Mass; used also by the first Popes in the catacombs. It was saved at great risk of life from the conflagration of 1318. There is abundant proof that in Africa the holy table was of wood up to the end of the fourth century. Athanasius, speaking of the outrages committed by Arians in the orthodox church, says that they burnt the table with other fittings of the church. The Donatists broke up and used for firewood the altars in the churches of their rivals. It is said they beat the Catholic Bishop cruelly with clubs as he stood ministering at the altar and afterwards with broken pieces of the timber of the altar. In Gaul, according to Martine, wooden altars were in use in the sixth century and in England up to a much later date. The historian William of Malmesbury records that Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester from 1062-95, demolished the wooden altars which still remained in his diocese as in ancient times; *altaria lignea jam unde a prisca diebus in Anglia*.

When in the fourth century the Church enjoyed freedom of worship, fixed altars of stone, square in shape, were principally used in Rome. The Christian sacrifice being without shedding of blood, the altar was always in the interior of a temple. If not a solid, simple block, it consisted of a horizontal slab of stone, or marble, supported by two upright slabs or by one or more pillars of polished stone. Some of these are still extant; witness that in the crypt of St. Cecilia in Rome, which is a stone slab resting on one column in the centre, and another, recently discovered at Avignon, having five pillars. Pope Virgilius describes how, when his persecutors sought to pull him away from the altar, he clung to the pillars, and the altar was so shaken that it would have fallen had not the clerics held it fast. In some of the earlier mosaics in the Cathedral of Ravenna the altar is represented as a table supported by columns with capitals; the tables are of red or gold color, indicating the use of porphyry or gilt bronze as the material. The altar of the Church of Santa Sophia in Constantinople, rebuilt by Justinian in 532, is of great magnificence, gold decorated with precious stones, resting on gold pillars. And as the nations of the West accumulated wealth on the cessation of the inroads of the Scandinavian sea kings, instances occur of the use of precious metals to show the reverence felt for the altar.

Yet the current of ecclesiastical legislation set steadily in favor of stone as the canonical material of the altar, and the rule was established that if not all, a part at least must be of stone—a slab large enough for the sacred vessels to stand upon, in which five crosses

were incised. Gregory of Nyssa mentions the stone of which altars were made being hallowed by consecration. The Council of Epaona (Pamiers, France) in 517 forbade any others but stone to be consecrated with chrism; and two and a half centuries later Charlemagne ordered that priests should not celebrate except *in mensis lapideis ab Episcopis consecratis*. In the East at all times the material of the altar was deemed of little importance; down to the present day wood, stone or metal is used. In England at the Reformation an order was issued to destroy the altars and replace them by wooden tables. In Mary's short reign this was reversed, but under Elizabeth the work was carried out so thoroughly that only in thirty instances do the old stone altar slabs yet exist. One of these alone is still in use at Arundel. At the time of the Crusades portable altars, *altaria viatica*, *gestatoria* were introduced. They generally consisted of a slab or disc of stone or marble set in a decorated metal frame.

In the early times the altar stood either in the centre of the nave or under the arch of the apse, on all sides free so that the worshipers could surround it. The officiating priest faced the people, as is still the case in St. Peter's at Rome, and there only, although in many churches in Italy the altar retains its ancient position. After the tenth century, the churches being more spacious, the altar was put back to the east end of the sanctuary, and the priest stood with his back to the people. The first known instance of the orientation of churches is that of St. Agatha in Ravenna, 417; yet from Apostolic times the early Christians were accustomed to look towards the east when praying, either in remembrance of their original home, the Paradise they had lost, or because the coming of Christ, the Sun of Justice, was looked for from the east. Later on the orientation of churches spread rapidly and became the rule.

Anciently there was never more than one altar in a church. Traces of a plurality of altars appear in the sixth century. Constantine erected three in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. In the ninth century the Church of St. Gall, in Switzerland, had seventeen altars. In early times the oblation was consecrated by the Bishops in their own churches and carried by deacons to others without the walls, or coemeteries, in which liberty to consecrate the sacred elements was not given. The decree of Anserre forbidding two Masses to be said at the same altar on one and the selfsame day contributed to the multiplication of altars, so much so that it had to be restrained by Charlemagne. There is now no rule as to the number of altars. There are twenty-five in St. Peter's, and elsewhere a still larger number. The Greeks have kept to the original rule of one altar only in each basilica. In the East, as in the West, a repository containing relics of the saints had its place

beneath the altar. This was a custom strictly adhered to, as St. Ambrose says (ad Marcellinum Ep. 85): *Ille* (Christus) *super altare, isti* (martyres) *sub altari*. It is recorded that some altars could not be consecrated for lack of relics.

To these two integral parts of the altar, the *mensa*, or table, the relics, *confessio*, in the crypt under the altar, in ancient times a third was added, the *ciborium*, or baldachin, over the altar. Usually, not invariably, the altar was raised on one or more steps and isolated by a balustrade or enclosed within low railings of wood, stone or metal, *ambitus altaris*, the *cancelli* of Italy. Upon these enclosures columns were erected, supporting arches from which curtains of rich material were suspended. The ciborium, umbraculum, as it was then called, was a canopy whereby the altar was covered, a pyramidal dome or round spire resting upon four pillars, generally of silver or marble, sometimes of gold or decorated with precious metals. The four pillars represented the four corners of the world (then believed to be square), in the midst of which the sacrifice of propitiation was offered. The superstructure symbolized the vault of heaven, the dove suspended therefrom the Holy Ghost hovering over the sacrifice sent by the Father to testify of the Son and invoked by the celebrant in the words: *Veni sanctificator*. From the four sides hung veils to hide the sight of the altar from the people during the sacrifice. The *oratio veli*, *Aufer a nobis*, said when the priest ascends the steps of the altar, was formerly said after the introit, and the curtains were not withdrawn until after the consecration; hence the custom of announcing it by the sound of the bell to the assembled worshippers. St. Chrysostom bids the people think when the veil is withdrawn that heaven is opened and the angels are descending, for Christ is slain anew. The distinguishing feature of Christian worship in the fourth and three or four following centuries is, as Mr. Bishop points out (*Downside Review*, W. 71, p. 5), the prominence and reverence given to the holy table as the place of sacrifice. It was considered too holy to bear anything but the mystic oblation itself and the sacred vessels, the linen cloths necessary for the offering of the "awful," "tremendous" sacrifice, the "Divine Mysteries." If the Book of the Gospels lay on the altar from the beginning of the Mass until the Gospel was read, it is to be remembered that the Gospel was regarded as representing our Lord Himself. Everything of the nature of ornamental accessory was around, above, but apart from the altar. In the idea new in the then triumphant Church that the holy sacrifice was not merely a "mystery of faith" that must be withdrawn from the eye of the unbeliever, but a mystery so "dread" that upon it not even the Christian might gaze, we have in a great measure the explanation of the

ciborium, as it was then called, the baldachin on four columns. First, the altar must be veiled; it afforded a convenient means of hanging up curtains. Secondly, it served for honor; the existence of a dais, a covering over and marking the seat of or station of the ruler, the pontiff, existed in the instinct of the people; it was surely fitting to render the same honor to the King of Kings. Lastly, it afforded opportunities for adorning the altar without infringing on the idea of the inviolable sanctity of the holy table. Was it desired to have lights over and around the altar? They could be hung from the ciborium. Flowers? the wreath could be twined round its columns, while precious metals, gold and jewels could enrich the altar by means of crowns suspended by chains from the roof of the ciborium.

In the East a screen with doors answered and still answers the same purpose as the curtains of the ciborium did of old in the West. To this day the *iconostasis* of the Russo-Greek Church effectually shuts off the people from the sacrifice of the altar. And here we may observe the different way of viewing the Christian sacrifice as an act of worship. In the Greek liturgies the dominant note is this: the concern of the officiating priest, personally and individually, for his own unworthiness to offer the sacrifice, whilst the Roman formulæ indicate that the sacrifice is the combined sacrifice of priest and people; *et plebis et praesulis*. In the East the iconostasis, like a wall separating the church into two distinct parts, one for the clergy, the other for the laity, prevented any development or modification of the altar. In the West the publicity of the Mass, the union, the junction of priest and people in offering the holy sacrifice maintained in spite of rood screens, has given room for change and evolution in the altar and its accessories.

The gold or silver dove, suspended by a chain from a ring or hook in the centre of the roof of the ciborium, was employed as a receptacle for the Sacred Host reserved for viaticum for the sick, not for the ordinary communion of the faithful nor as an object of worship. It would appear that previously to the fourth century there was no reservation of the Blessed Sacrament on account probably of the danger of desecration in times of persecution; at any rate, ecclesiastical writers are silent on this point. The dove was a symbol of Christ; of Christ on the altar clothed with the Holy Spirit. Tertullian calls the Church *colombae domus*. This was the most ancient form of pyx. An iron hook may yet be seen in the cupola of the ciborium of several ancient Roman basilicas, whence to suspend the dove or the chest containing it. Martigny asserts that not unfrequently a lesser ciborium resting upon the altar, called peristerion, or *turris*, supposed to represent the sepulchre of our Lord hewn in

the rock, contained the pyx. Constantine the Great gave to St. Peter's a paten, tower and dove of refined gold decorated with 215 pearls and weighing thirty pounds. Pope St. Hilary gave to the baptistery of St. John Lateran a silver chest or tower—*turrem argenteam*—containing the *columbam auream*. The doves were sometimes of ivory or copper gilt. These "towers" were generally cylindrical, with a dome or vaulted roof. It is probably of them that mention is made in the pastoral of Pope Leo IV. at the close of the eighth century, restricting the objects placed on the altar to "shrines (capsae) with relics of the saints, or perchance the four Holy Gospels, and a pyx or tabernacle in which our Lord's Body was reserved for the sick." Tapers were not allowed upon the altar in early times, though it was an ancient practice to place lights about it, especially on festivals, as typical of hope and joy or of the light of faith and charity. The candlesticks stood around or were held by acolytes. The presence of relics upon the altar was an innovation, since originally nothing was permitted to be placed on it except what appertained to the holy sacrifice. Odo of Cluny states that in the ninth century when relics of St. Walburgis were laid on the altar they ceased to work miracles, resenting being placed "*ubi majestas divini mysterii solummodo debet celebrari.*"

The change, we are told, involved in the permission cited above to place relics on the table was destined to modify the character, disposition and even situation of the altar. The new spirit of devotion to relics and the desire of acquiring them, often entire bodies of saints, required that instead of lying underground they should be raised up, put on the altar. Moreover, the Norman incursions in the latter half of the ninth century compelled many priests and monks along the whole of Western France and the seacoast of England to convey the bodies of the saints wherewith their churches were enriched farther inland for safety. These translations by bringing new relics to churches promoted the cultus and also contributed to bring into fashion portable reliquaries or shrines as distinguished from the tombs or repositories of solid masonry beneath the altar. It was also desired that the reliquary should no longer be under the altar, concealed by antependia, plates of gold or silver, chased and representing subjects of Gospel history or by draperies hung round the sides of the holy table, but be placed on or above it. "It is to be remembered (Mr. Bishop says) that at the time of which we speak the practice of dividing the bodies of the saints was not yet in vogue; indeed, it ran counter to the then prevalent feelings of reverence. Shrines were therefore large, as large as the altar, larger, indeed, than the simple cubes which ancient piety had found sufficient and becoming. The relic chest, which required a

solid base, was commonly placed at right angles with the altar, close to the back and in the centre of it, one end resting upon the altar itself, forming (as it was adorned with jewels) a rich centrepiece where our tabernacle now stands. Under this new system of arrangement the ciborium was made to cover not the altar only, but the shrine also, and gradually it fell into disuse. . . . Whereas the old altars had, as it were, neither back nor front, but were free all round and looked alike to the singers and the people on the nave side and to the clergy ministrant in the presbytery, the new combination of altar and shrine gave to the altar a back and a front; so the way was paved for placing, in defiance both of precedent and ancient reverence, the altar against the wall of the church. Moreover, there arose a natural tendency to lengthen the altar, and the fashion once started, the oblong shape became more and more pronounced. This of itself tended to hasten the disuse of the old ciborium resting on four columns and with solid roof, and with its disappearance other changes came. We have seen that it served on its summit to bear the cross, beneath suspended lights and pendant crowns, besides curtains and adornments devised by ingenious piety. For these a place must be found. The principle of the inviolability of the Lord's board once infringed, the practice of its infringement was destined to go far. The holy table being no longer reserved exclusively for the sacrifice, why should not a cross, lights, flowers be placed on it? So it was done, little by little, now here, now there." The pyx was suspended from branches, brackets or from figures of angels.

Although the ciborium in most places disappeared, the altar was not left without canopy or covering. In the thirteenth century several councils, in South Germany particularly, prescribed that a white linen cloth should be stretched above the altar over its whole length and breadth, to keep off dust and as a mark of reverence. This was only to provide for cases of poverty; elsewhere the canopy or *cclatura* might be of rich materials. Linen altar cloths, *mappae*, were also laid on the altar slab to preserve cleanliness and prevent any particle of the Sacred Body or drop of the Precious Blood being lost. They symbolized the clean linen cloth wherein the Lord's Body was wrapped, and were requisite in Apostolic times more especially when the bread crumbled when broken, the loaves offered by the faithful being used. These linen cloths were three in number. If the priest by negligence spilled the Precious Blood on the super-altare he was required to do penance for three days. If any drops fell on the first cloth (*linteum supernus*) only, the penalty was four days' penance; if they soaked to the lower (*inferius*), nine days; if to the fourth (*usque ad quartum*), twenty days.

Another cause contributed to a change of form in the altar, intro-

ducing the long narrow shape common in the West. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries churches were rebuilt, cathedrals and monastic houses erected on a much larger scale than heretofore, and small and simple altars made of fine stones were no longer approved of. Somewhat later the shrines originally placed behind and close to the altar were with the adoption of long choirs in the Gothic structures detached in many cases from the high altar and placed eastward, so that pilgrims could more easily pay their devotions at them. The isolation of the altar consequent on the removal of the shrine brought in the solid reredos, the pattern for which was furnished by the hanging dossal curtains or the decoration of the east wall where the altar had been placed against it. The use of retables, almost the earliest instances of which are the retable of gold in St. Mark's, Venice, and the gold retable given by Henri II. of France in 1019 to the Cathedral of Basle (now in the Cluny museum), became general and were enlarged so as to form the base of the reredos, a base resting, moreover, not unfrequently on the altar itself. These retables or reredoses, small and simple in the Romano-Byzantine style, were in the Gothic churches large and imposing structures, affording a wide field for the exercise of the arts of the sculptor and painter, and by their size and elaborate decoration throwing the altar itself into insignificance. The grand altar pieces of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seem to have for their main feature "an accumulation of accessory ornament at the expense of the thing itself for the sake of which the ornament exists." This appears an inversion of the ideas prevalent in early Christian days, when the very altar of God itself was the thought to which everything else was subservient, whereas in later times the altar, overloaded in many churches with every manner of ornament, reliquaries, vases, candlesticks and images, seems only intended to dazzle the beholder. In some places the earlier practice survives. In the ancient altars of several French cathedrals the severity of earlier ages is said to have been maintained until the Revolution.

One more point in connection with the Christian altar remains to be mentioned. The Blessed Sacrament reserved, now the central object of our churches, was not so formerly. "In the Middle Ages (we again quote from the *Downside Review*) the idea connected with the *Sainte Réserve*, even after the popularization of the Corpus Christi procession and the spread of the use of the monstrance, was not that of worship nor of communion. Even the devout then communicated but four or five times a year and at the great feasts. The parish priest knew the number of his intending communicants on each occasion and consecrated the required number of hosts accordingly. In mediæval times the usual place of reservation (for

the viaticum of the sick) was some recess or cupboard, often closed with iron bars, in the wall on the Gospel side of the altar. Sometimes (as Bishop Devie says was the case in the district of Bresse, north of Lyons) the *petite armoire grillée* was *au fond du chœur*. We read that the Blessed Sacrament was kept *in quodam angulo*, in an out-of-the-way corner of the Cathedral of Verona up to the middle of the sixteenth century, when Bishop Ghiberti, a great reformer, had it enclosed in a tabernacle of marble and crystal, borne by four angels in brass and suspended over (not placed upon) the high altar, that he might excite the devout to Godly piety towards the reserved sacrament of the altar. This case was an anticipation of later devotional feeling. With the gradual increase of frequent communion the inconveniences of the old arrangement were increasingly felt, and the tabernacle upon the altar was the obvious way out of them. The once exclusive idea of viaticum gave way to that of communion in the reservation on the altar; yet even up to a late period in many parts of the continent the Hosts for the sick were reserved in a place (*loculus in muro*) apart from the altar, whilst the Hosts for communicants were reserved in the tabernacle on the high altar." A relic of this former discipline remains in the prescription derived from Roman practice that the Blessed Sacrament is not to be reserved at the high altar of cathedrals, but at a side altar.

From the history of the Christian altar we may pass to that of the chalice.

THE CHALICE.

Chalice is the word adopted by the Church to designate the vessel in which the wine for the Holy Eucharist is consecrated. It is derived, like the German *kelch*, from the cup-like calia of a flower or the husk of corn, and is used in a figurative sense in Holy Scripture, meaning a lot, from the early custom when drawing lots, of putting beans or balls into a cup. Thus we read in the Psalms: "The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and my cup" (Ps. xv., 5). And the prophets frequently speak of the "cup of God's wrath" about to be poured out upon a sinful nation (Is. li., 17). Our Lord also in His agony prays that the chalice of His Passion may pass away. Whether Christ Himself partook of the chalice when He instituted the Holy Eucharist is an important question, since heretics who deny transubstantiation confidently affirm that He did so, quoting in proof the words He spoke: "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until the day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God" (St. Mark xiv., 25). Of all the fathers, Augustine and Chrysostom alone admit this theory, on the strength of those

words. Jerome denies that they refer to the Eucharistic cup, and later writers agree with him. "*Non pertinet* (he says) *ad calicem eucharisticum, sed ad calicem qui datus fuit post agni poschalis manducationem.*" Hence it is probable that our Lord conformed to the ancient custom of passing round, after banquets of ceremony, a goblet filled with wine, now known as the grace cup, as a sign of fraternal concord or benediction; it was termed *calix salutaris*, or *calix inebrians*. To participation in this the passage cited above doubtless refers.

St. Athanasius and St. Ambrose speak of the sacred chalice as *vas dominicum*, *poculum mysticum*. It is impossible to determine how soon it was distinguished in form, material or ornament from the cups used in ordinary life. At first there was probably little or no distinction between the Eucharistic cup and that of the domestic table; the eventually exclusive adoption of the name of *calix* to designate the former may be thought to imply that the cup specifically so called had a special form. The word denoted a somewhat shallow bowl with two handles and a foot. Of this shape are the chalices represented in the paintings of the first centuries. They appear in early times to have been small in size, the bowl hemispherical in form, with a short stem and a foot, almost like a cup, as is the one of yellow jasper preserved in St. John Lateran. A chalice brought from Jerusalem in the fifth century by St. Jerome is of similar form; it is of Syrian manufacture and of opaline glass. Later on the bowl of the chalice was much deeper, standing on a large conical or funnel-shaped foot, the knot, or rather knob, *nodus*, *pomellum*, half way up the stem being invariably present. The variety of size in ancient chalices, the very small size of some, leads to the supposition that the smaller ones were for the clergy, while the larger, two-handled ones, were used for the purpose of dispensing the Precious Blood to the people. When the laity no longer communicated in both kinds the chalices with handles seem to have disappeared. Ecclesiastical antiquity distinguishes three different kinds of chalices: offertorial, in which the wine offered by the faithful for the holy sacrifice was poured by the deacons; communicational, in which the wine was consecrated, and ministerial, in which it was administered to the people. A practice at one time existed of the clergy alone communicating from the chalice of consecration, a few drops only being poured out of it into that offered to the laity. Thus the consecrated wine was mixed with unconsecrated, which the communicants drank by means of a tube, *fistula* or *pugillaris*, in French called *chalumeau*, of gold or silver attached to the chalices. These were capable of holding a considerable quantity and were multiplied in proportion to the number of communicants. Sometimes there were as many

as seven or eight chalices on the altar. When this custom originated and how long it lasted seems obscure. Pope Gregory II. expressed disapproval of the usage of placing more than one chalice upon the altar. If the vases found in the catacombs are taken for chalices, P. Secchi remarks, one must suppose that every communicant had his or her own, into which the deacon poured the Precious Blood from a ministerial chalice. These vessels were of glass, decorated with gold leaf.

It is impossible to determine of what material the chalice used by our Lord at the Last Supper was made. It is claimed that the glass goblet preserved at Genoa is the one of which He made use when instituting the Holy Eucharist. St. Joseph of Arimathea is said to have brought it to Glastonbury, but the vessel he brought (if indeed he brought any) was more probably that in which he collected some portion of the Precious Blood when washing the wounds on our Lord's Sacred Body preparatory to its deposition in the sepulchre. In the seventh century Venerable Bede mentions a large silver chalice as the true one, but there are no proofs of the authenticity of any of those which are asserted to have been hallowed by the Redeemer's hands. The search for the Holy Grail, the *Sangreal*, formed the subject of many romances and epics in the Middle Ages.

The earliest chalices in use in the Christian Church were undoubtedly of glass or wood. The Roman martyrology states that Bishop Donatus repaired by prayer the consecrated glass vessel which the heathen broke at Aretum (Arezzo) in the time of Julian the Apostate. St. Jerome, speaking of Eusebius, Bishop of Toulouse, and commending his frugality, says "he ministered the Body of Christ in a basket of osiers and the Precious Blood in a glass cup." But it was only by monks and in the poorer churches that the use of glass was retained. That the richer churches had chalices of precious metal is proved by the fact that the sacred vessels were sometimes sold for the redemption of captives or for the relief of the poor. And that valuable chalices were in use at Antioch appears from an exclamation of the imperial treasurer on seeing the treasures of the Church which were confiscated by the prefect Julian: "*Ecce quam sumptuosius vasis filio mariae ministratur.*" This is confirmed by St. Augustine when commenting on Psalms cxiii., 4. The idols of the Gentiles are silver and gold; he says that Christians also have many vessels of the same materials in use for celebrating the sacraments. Queen Brunhilda presented a chalice of onyx inlaid with gold to the Cathedral of Auxerre in the ninth century. And amongst the rich presents sent by the Byzantine Emperor Michael III. in 857 to Pope Nicholas was a gold chalice set with numerous jewels. The

earliest chalice now existing, preserved in the Bibliothèque Imperiale of Paris, dating from the fourth or fifth century, is of white opaque glass, with a metal foot. In the Church of St. Anastasius in Rome is one of metal gilt, with an hemispherical bowl, supposed to have belonged to St. Lambert, 708. In the ninth century Pope Leo IV. forbade the use of lead for the chalice, though pewter or glass was allowed. This prohibition was renewed by an English Council in 887. Popes Zephyrus and Urban I. both ordered the exclusive use of gold or silver for the sacred vessels. Copper, horn or bone, wood and glass were prohibited by the Council of Rheims 815; the first because it provokes nausea, the second because they are impure, the third because it is absorbent, the fourth on account of being brittle. The poverty of some churches prevented strict obedience to this prohibition; glass was used in some places until a much later period. Glass or ivory mounted in gold or pewter chalices were considered superior to glass. The use of bronze was exceptional and peculiar to Irish monks. St. Gall refused to use silver, saying that St. Columban was accustomed to offer the Holy Sacrifice in a chalice of bronze (*aereis*), alleging as a reason that our Lord was fastened to the Cross with bronze nails. The traditional use of bronze lingered long amongst the successors of the Irish missionaries in South Germany. In 1875 the Sacred Congregation of Rites prohibited the use of valueless metal or copper gilt for chalices, although they authorized aluminium in exceptional cases. At the same time women and laymen (unless they were clerks) were forbidden under pain of mortal sin to touch the chalice.

From early times gold and silver chalices adorned with jewels were presented by monarchs, princes and prelates. Some of these were of great weight, too heavy for use, and were placed on the altar as ornaments on solemn festivals. Chalices were anciently consecrated by prayer and anointed with chrism. They were frequently adorned with pious representations to guard against profane use, chased or enameled on the cup or the foot, such as the Good Shepherd and other suitable subjects. Many bore inscriptions, the name of the giver or a pious epigram expressing the destiny of the cup; for instance, on a chalice given by St. Remy to his cathedral church were these lines:

Hauriat hinc populus vitam de sanguine sacro
Iniecto æternus quem fudit vulnere Christus.

ELLIS SCHREIBER.

A TOUR IN EGYPT.

FOR all those who feel the instinct of reverence for the past and delight in antiquity, massive and hoary, Egypt stands out alone as a paradise upon earth. For such travelers, to visit Egypt for a few days is but to catch the Nile fever, which can only be cured when the opportunity comes for a prolonged stay and an intimate acquaintance with the banks of the Nile. In these few pages I have to record the impressions of one who spent some five weeks in the land of the Pharaohs in order to recover from one fever, and who came back with another not so easily to be cured. Our carrier, the *Delos*, of the *Deutsche Levante Line*, left Malta on February 15 with a cargo of railway sleepers for Jappa and seven saloon passengers representing their respective nations, Germany, France, England and Roumania. The *Algeçiras* conference was then at a somewhat critical phase, and the general hope on board was that we should not reach our destination to find ourselves public enemies. I was much struck by the politeness of the Germans on board, both passengers and crew. When the French passengers wanted to talk the general conversation was always in French, the autocrat of the breakfast table being a cultured German from San Paulo, Brazil, who spoke French and English fluently. As we had a very fair share of stormy weather, the poor deck passengers, who were herded together like sheep, had to suffer all kinds of horrors. My berth mate, a charitable Frenchman, took a big pile of baggage belonging to one of them into our cabin to shelter it from the rain. Owing to the strong wind against us we did not reach Alexandria until February 20, after a four and a half days' passage.

Alexandria, the home of the Ptolemies and of Cleopatra, of Euclid and Eratosthenes, of Origen, St. Catherine and St. Athanasius, possesses few monuments of its former greatness. All these were laid low in the name of Allah and his prophet, and the superb granite monoliths which once adorned the city and which had been carried down the Nile from the quarries of Syene were thrown into the sea to break the waves or extend the seaboard. Even the configuration of the land has changed, and the *Heptastadion*, which was once an artificial isthmus connecting the ancient town and island of Alexandria with the mainland, is now a broad strip of land forming an important part of the modern city.

The prevailing religion seems to be the worship of the piastre, but other denominations exist. As far as Catholicism is concerned, Egypt is still a missionary country, *i. e.*, the hierarchy and a native secular clergy have not yet been established. In fact, a secular priest

is a rarity in Egypt. It is very consoling, however, to see the serious pioneer work which is being done, especially in the way of education, by the Christian Brothers, Franciscans, Marists and Jesuits and by the various sisterhoods in Alexandria and Cairo. The great hope of the future lies in the conversion of the Nestorian Copts, some 600,000 in number. If this large branch of Christianity ever becomes reingrafted on the stem from which it broke there will be some hope of making an impression on the Mussulmans, who predominate in Egypt.

The French Jesuit "Collège de Saint François Xavier" in Alexandria is a fine palatial building, but as it only offers a liberal education the number of students is hardly above 160. The sister "Collège de la Sainte Fanielle" at Cairo has about 450, an influx of some 300 having come in when the school narrowed down its course on more commercial lines. It is thought better to have at least one seat of higher learning in the country for such as do not wish to net Parnassus' stream for piastres and pounds Egyptian.

Six days in Cairo gives the traveler an opportunity of seeing something, even when he is in no hurry to see everything. Cairo is more Oriental than Alexandria, but still very European. The Arab quarter, however, is strictly Eastern and contains some gems of Moslem architecture. The Mosque of Azhar, or the "University," is famous for its colonnades, one of which forms what might be mistaken for a monastic cloister. The rest of the building mainly consists of a gigantic roof supported on columns which divide the interior into five aisles. Furnished with galoshes over our shoes, we entered the "holy" precincts—a sort of Mussulman synagogue frequented by 10,000 students. We saw perhaps some 2,000 of these, beardless youths and hoary veterans, squatting on mats under the cloister roof, about the courtyard and along the five aisles of the main building. All seemed to be studying law and the Koran. Some were listening to professors seated on stool or mat, some were reading alone, others in company. The private students swayed their bodies to and fro like pendulums as they repeated the words of the Koran in a way that suggested rote or rhythm rather than intelligent study. The sound of many voices was like the hubbub of a market minus the wrangling and shouting. All universities require some sort of policing, so I suppose this one was no exception to the rule. Order there undoubtedly was, though the lines of organization were not very distinct. It was the order of a beehive or some rather unstructural commonwealth.

Most of the flower of portable antiquity in Egypt is gathered up in the Cairo Museum and stands instructively arranged in chronological order. All the really fine statuary belongs to the fourth and

fifth dynasties and must have been already ancient in the days of Abraham. The artists who produced the supposed statue of Cheops and the so-called Sheik el Beled might have been succeeded in a generation by a Memphite Phidias, but they never were, and for some unaccountable reason Egyptian art after them became conventional and unlikelike, and remained so until the days of the Ptolemies. Infinite labor was spent in carving colossal figures out of granite and diorite, but the value of such work was architectural rather than sculptural.

The Zoölogical Gardens of Cairo are well laid out, but not so well stocked with representative African fauna. I was hoping to find there at least a live crocodile from the Nile, but the only representative of the genus was the Mississippi alligator. Clearly, in one respect, at any rate, the Nile is played out. The day may yet come when Egypt will have to call on America for a new Sphinx.

Out of mercy to the reader I will say nothing about the pyramids, except that when I saw them they rested in their usual glory. The bracing desert air, the donkey ride and subsequent lunch all helped to make the mind appreciative.

Cairo will probably soon be able to boast of its million inhabitants, and, roughly speaking, is twice as large as Alexandria. In spite of the absence of drainage pipes it is a healthy city. A shower of rain there is a rare occurrence, but when it does come down the streets in the Arab quarter are covered with thick mud for days after. Herodotus writes of the scrupulous cleanliness of the ancient Egyptians and of their frequent ablutions. Fashions have changed since then.

Whoever has not seen Luxor has hardly seen ancient Egypt. Cairo lies on the 30th parallel, Luxor below the 26th, and the distance between them may be covered by rail in thirteen hours. The modern town of Luxor, which is not much better than a mud village with a few spacious hotels, lies on the right or eastern bank of the Nile. In and about it are the massive ruins of Thebes, recalling the days of the second Theban Empire, which began about B. C. 1600 and was still in existence in the days of Roboam. Most of the ruins belong to this period, though there are remains of the earlier Theban Empire, which began probably about 3000 B. C.

Near the Luxor station stands the temple of Amenophes III., having most of its columns still intact, with their beautiful massive capitals shaped like an inverted bell. The orthodox impression to be produced by these and similar buildings is the feeling of being *écrasé*, and the impression, if duly received, is further intensified by the still more gigantic temples of Karnak, which stand at about half an hour's walk from Luxor. The great hall of the temple built by

Seti I. and Rameses II. is supported by columns twelve feet in diameter and sixty-two feet in height. These colossal structures, by whatever devices they were erected, seem to tell through the ages how cheap was human labor and human suffering in the days of the Pharaohs and how heavy was the hand of the megalomaniac builder Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression.

Crossing the Nile at a reasonable hour in the morning, the traveler may enjoy a delightful ride through the crisp desert air on the back of one of that spirited breed of donkeys which abounds in Egypt. His way will lie through a mountain valley in the Libyan wilderness to the burial ground of the Theban Kings. There, in the heart of the limestone rock, are the hewn out galleries and chambers which once held the remains of Amenôthes II., son of Thothmes III., Seti I., Rameses III. and numerous other Theban monarchs and notables. The walls of the tombs are richly ornamented with symbolic paintings and heiroglyphic inscriptions, which are now clearly seen by the electric light, the magnesian flame whose fumes have blackened many a roof being now happily abolished. The tomb of Amenôthes II., which was opened to the public in 1900, is not defaced or blackened in any way, and the paintings in it look as fresh as if they had been laid on last century instead of fourteen centuries before Christ. Here, too, the body of the Pharaoh, with the features exposed, is left in the place which it originally occupied, whereas most of his brother monarchs are in the Cairo Museum.

Crossing the mountain ridge back in the direction of Luxor we again reach the plain where, between the green fields and the mountains, is to be seen another vast collection of temples and tombs. The most splendid of the sepulchres is the tomb and temple of Thothmes III., the conquering hero of the eighteenth dynasty, the victor of Megiddo and subduer of Phœnicia and the islands. The body of the monarch, like that of many others, was not allowed to remain long in its resting place. The violation of tombs was a favorite pursuit of Egyptian robbers almost as far back as the days of Moses. "From the early days of the twentieth dynasty," says Professor G. Maspero,¹ "the Theban police were charged with the duty of protecting the tombs . . . from the attacks of the robbers who were making capital out of the violation of the necropolis of Thebes. In the village of Gurnah and near the temples of the city of Medinet Habu, most of the inhabitants had formed themselves into bands, and having frequently the guards and local functionaries as accomplices, they had penetrated into the best secured tombs, opened the coffins, broken the mummies and carried off everything they could find in the way of jewelry, gold and silver and other

¹ Guide to the Cairo Museum.

precious things. . . . The reigns of the Ramessides of the twentieth dynasty were mainly spent in trying to put a stop to [these depredations], but with so little success that on the death of the last King the high priests of Amon, now lords of Thebes, resolved to secure the mummies, which were most revered, . . . from the profanation to which they were exposed. They had these mummies taken from their tombs and hidden in groups in various parts of the necropolis of Thebes. The operations were conducted so secretly that they escaped the notice of the robbers. Gradually the places were forgotten, even by those who had selected them, and the Pharaohs who had been removed slept in peace until our own days."

The first of these hiding places was discovered in 1875. In July, 1881, the museum barge started for Bulaq, the then site of the museum, with a cargo of Kings. "It was remarkable," says Mr. Maspero, "that between Luxor and Quft, on both sides of the Nile, the fellahin women followed the boat uttering loud cries, with their hair all disheveled, while the men fired guns as they do at funerals." The mummy on which are still clear the slight form and delicate features of Thothmes III. is now to be seen in the museum at Cairo. His burial place, which had been violated during the twentieth dynasty, was discovered in 1898.

Thothmes III. died probably in the year 1449 B. C., and thus it has happened that the dust and the tomb of a ruler who was almost as ancient to Cæsar as Cæsar is to us have remained entire, while not a relic of Cæsar survives. Not far from the temple of Thothmes III. stands the Ramesseum, wherein lies the colossal statue of Rameses II. destroyed by an earthquake. As the merits of this monument of art without inspiration are chiefly expressible in figures, let it be enough to say that the probable weight of the statue was some 900 tons and that the length of the index finger is 3 1-5 feet.

The Ramesseum, while providing materials for study to the Orientalist who wishes to acquaint himself with the truth about the Hittite War and the battle of Kadesh, offers besides a convenient halting place for luncheon to the uninitiated traveler who has taken his own victuals along with him. From the shade of one of the gigantic columns he may watch, as he takes his refreshment, the falcons hovering above the lofty capitals or resting in the crannies of the temple, which has been their domain for more than thirty centuries. When his luncheon and his reflections are ended he may ride to another collection of rock tombs, and then to the great palace of Rameses III. Here he will see the founder of the palace still living upon the walls and smiting his enemies, Philistines, Sardinians and Sicilians, who cower, run or take their fate in very conventional attitudes.

Along the way back from the palace of Rameses III. to the Nile stand the two colossi of Memnon in the midst of green cornfields. They stand about fifty-two feet above their pedestals and are surpassed in size only by the shattered figure in the Ramesseum. One of them is the famous vocal statue. It was thrown down by an earthquake, but set up again under Septimius Severus, and has never spoken since.

Pity it is that no Greek traveler familiar with Athens in the days of Pericles has left us his impressions of a visit to Thebes. Quaint old Herodotus, though he says many charming things about the people and the animals of Egypt, and though, unlike other Greeks, he had considerable knowledge and appreciation of Egyptian culture, is, nevertheless, much more concerned with the theology of the Egyptian gods than with the wonderful temples in which they were enshrined. He visited Thebes, to be sure, and was an eye-witness of the scenes which the modern traveler vainly strives to conjure up in his imagination. He saw the multitudinous and massive temples of the Nile Valley with their graven records of the past. He saw the long avenues of Sphinxes and heroes not, as now, in fragments, but in unbroken lines of polished granite linking temple with temple and palace with palace. Yet these do not appear to be the things he went forth to see. The purpose of his visit was to hunt up scraps of priest-lore and genealogies.

The Greeks knew nothing of hieroglyphics, so that a modern scholar will find far more history among the ruins of Egypt than Herodotus was able to gather from the monuments when they were entire. The priests who answered the many questions of the garrulous stranger must have maintained considerable reserve or else have been imperfectly versed in the science of reading and collating their own records.

A continuous history, even of Greece, was a novel thing in the days of Herodotus, and it would have been too much to expect of the Father of History to do more than touch upon that of Egypt. We should have been glad, however, to know what impression was made on his mind by the contrast he saw between the ponderous majesty of Egyptian architecture and the more refined beauty of the Ionic temples.

There is one point of contrast, at least, which we in these our later days are better able to appreciate than were the Greeks of the fifth century before Christ. The style of the Egyptian monuments, whether they be sculptures or written texts, is angular and quaint. So is that of Herodotus, and so, too, were the sculptures which adorned the Grecian temples before the days of Phidias. But in the latter instances the angularity was that of vigorous youth and rapid

growth, while in the former it was incident to the deadness of an art whose development had long since been arrested. The difference is something like that which exists between the pictures of Giotto and those on a pack of cards.

Just below the twenty-fifth parallel and on the left or western bank of the Nile there stands, in the mud built village of Edfu, the great temple of Horus (Apollo). Though many of the faces of the reliefs on its walls have been, as in many another temple, scratched out by the early Coptic monophysites, this majestic edifice is probably the best preserved antique building in the world. Though built under the Ptolemies, it is entirely Egyptian in character, and the Grecian monarchs are represented triumphing over their foes or communing with the gods of the land after the same manner as their more ancient predecessors at Thebes and Abydos. The temple was freed by Aug. Mariette from the rubbish in which it was buried, but the inward pressure of the débris outside had been so great as to give a dangerous list to the massive girdle wall on its eastern side and to several of the columns. The crest of the wall was as much as 80 centimetres out of the perpendicular. At the time of our visit the silent fellahin, whose fathers perhaps had built their mud hovels on the top of the buried temple, were busy taking down and resetting the huge blocks of which the columns are composed, their work being directed by the distinguished Italian Orientalist, Mr. Bar-Santi. This work of readjusting large portions of such a gigantic edifice must involve very considerable expense, and the tourist who sees the reconstruction going on is consoled to think that the \$6.25 paid for his pass ticket to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt is not likely to lie by for very long.

The temple of Edfu is not a ruin. Of the repairs which it is undergoing actual addition form but a secondary part. When a new door, taller than many a two-storied house, is fitted into the ancient doorway the whole building will probably present most of the salient features which it possessed in the days of the later Ptolemies. On the outer face of the girdle wall is related the history of its construction. From the various inscriptions we learn that from the foundation stone to the finishing touch the temple was 180 years in the building (237-57 B. C.)—a period of growth worthy of its prolonged existence. For this latter we have to thank the kindly dust of the Nile, which in alliance with the dry desert air has stood out in defense of the past and saved many an Egyptian monument from the tooth of time.

Just above the twenty-fourth parallel, where the pent-up waters of the Nile make a great artificial lake, the many templed Island of Philae, the Pearl of Egypt, may be seen standing against a back-

ground of palm trees out of the flood by which it is partly submerged. The beauty of the scene is intensified if the traveler contrives to arrange his visit towards sunset. The object which first arrests his attention is the Kiosk or temple of Trajan, with its slender and graceful columns surmounted by floral capitals, in which the usual Egyptian massiveness has given way to the more delicate proportions of the Grecian style. After being rowed through the columns the tourist may land at the temple of Isis and visit the other buildings which stand out at various heights above the level of the water. The feeling uppermost in his mind will be one of melancholy at the thought that this noble pile of ruins is doomed, sooner or later to destruction. It has been said by some engineers that the temples might have been underpinned with iron beams and lifted up to a dry level at moderate expense. However true this may be, it is too late to make the experiment now, and the destruction of Philae will be remembered as a deed which has helped much to mar the triumphs of modern engineering.

A row of some four miles from Philae to the barrage of the Nile brings us to a scene of very different interest. Here old Father Nile, after ages of alternate niggardliness and profusion, has at length been taught a lesson in economy and keeps his gifts locked up for seasonable distribution. After a "Hip, hip, hurra!" from our Nubian boatman we disembark in the full moonlight onto the deserted dam at its eastern end. The thickness of the structure sloping down on our left is hidden by the water, while on the right, beneath the sheer face of the wall, lies the former bed of the river. The broad expanse of the Nile has come to an abrupt pause at the seemingly thin partition and lounges sulkily upon the barrier, like a giant confined within his own castle, who looks forward to the day when he may burst forth suddenly from his restraint and ravage the land that has grown prosperous by his captivity.

At first all is silent, but a walk of some distance along the crest of the dam brings us within hearing of the water which forces its way through the sluices near the left bank of the river. Soon the barrier begins to tremble, and when we see the principal outlet we are able to form a vivid idea of the power of the pent-up waters on the one hand and on the other the massive strength of the masonry which controls their flow. The innumerable bags of cement piled up along the embankment are a sign that the victory over the straining flood is not yet complete. The rush of the water has already worn the bearings of the sluices, and sloping "aprons" of cement have been found necessary in order to ease off the sudden spurt. The expense of this necessary tinkering will not be very great, and when the work is finished the dam will probably be able

to bear a further addition to its height and withstand a still greater pressure of the water. Every additional foot of water in the lake above the dam means a wider area of distribution and greater prosperity for Egypt.

A donkey ride by moonlight across the desert from the barrage to Assuan is an experience not soon to be forgotten. Though it is some two hours after sunset the vigorous little beasts seem eager for their run and need no encouragement or direction from their attendants. These latter interfered only when we reached the town and when the mention of the hotel for which we were destined was not a sufficient clue to the animals themselves.

We had, unfortunately, no time to visit Elephantine, an island just opposite the town of Assuan and the furthest point reached by Herodotus in his travels.² After saying Mass at the church of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart and breakfasting at the hotel, we had to hurry off to the railway station and start on the hot and dusty railway journey to Cairo.

A few days in Egypt does not give any one the opportunity of forming trustworthy opinions about its inhabitants. The impression, however, which we received was that of a happy, industrious and law-abiding people among whom one might be at least as safe on a dark night as in many a more civilized community. As long as his religious fanaticism is not roused the Egyptian seems to be a very tractable member of the human species. Recent events seem to show that though he hates the Turk as the worst of tyrants, he will be ready if called upon to fight for the Head of Islam, however bad, against any Christian ruler, however good. Much as he would regret to have to make the choice, he would have no hesitation in making it.

JAMES KENDAL, S. J.

Malta.

² Herodotus II., 29.

CALVIN AND THE AUTHOR OF "THE PRINCE."

A FEW years ago Mr. John Morley published a monograph on "Machiavelli," in the course of which he argued that a theocracy was an impossible form of government. The nearest approach to the establishment of one was made in Geneva by John Calvin, he postulated, and there in the end the experiment had proved a failure, as it was bound ultimately to do. In reviewing Mr. Morley's essay in the *Catholic World* the present writer pointed out to the distinguished author and statesman that such an experiment had been tried in other places with perfect success, and referred to the case of the Jesuit settlement in Paraguay as one in point. A copy of the publication which contained the criticism was sent to Mr. Morley, and he courteously thanked the writer for having it forwarded; but so far he seems not to have made any use of the enlightenment. No doubt he will do so in due time, if he live, for Mr. Morley is too scrupulous a man to ignore correction when courteously made and with no other object than the ascertainment of historical truth.

There was never a more signal success in the experiment of inducing uncivilized tribes into the ways of orderly living and the knowledge and practice of Christianity than the settlement of Paraguay by members of the Jesuit Order. Similar experiments were carried out in other regions of South America, but in a minor degree. In Paraguay the element of permanency seemed to have been won for the system, but the spirit of unrest and destruction that swept over the Southern colonies of Spain a century ago blighted the fair hope. It reversed the results of patient endeavor and persistent prayer carried on for many years by the devoted sons of St. Ignatius, and the Freemason now rules where for generations only the gentle rule of the religious was known.

Although not exactly a theocracy, as the Jesuit system in Paraguay might be called—a theocracy under a civil overlord—the rule of the Franciscans in California toward the close of the eighteenth century might well be considered by Mr. Morley. In the admirable "History of the Franciscan Missions" left us by the lamented Mr. Byran J. Clinch there is much that would certainly give a man of his bent of mind great satisfaction as an experimental statesman and broad-minded philanthropist. He himself is now dealing, as Secretary for India, with many problems in the government of rude tribes and besotted religious beliefs hoary with age; and the story of how the religious orders of the Catholic Church wrestled with those early troubles of the wilderness must have an interest for such a scholarly

statesman as he. There is no counterpart for it in the history of any other religious organization in the whole world.

This brief retrospect is suggested by the appearance of a new life of Calvin, as one of the "Heroes of the Reformation" series. The author is Williston Walker, Titus-street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. Though he is an admirer of the reformer's, he has some embarrassment in the matter of establishing Calvin's claim to be a hero, and he seems to feel some diffidence as to the success of his labored attempt. Calvin had plenty of doubts but few convictions when the hour that marked the turning point in his career came. He was arrested and thrown into prison, in his native city, Noyon, on the nominal charge of having caused an uproar in the church there. But contemporaries of his have left a very different version of the offense which led to his arrest. It was declared by them to be one of that unmentionable class whose legal punishment at that time was death by burning. Historians of either inclining, Roman Catholic and Calvinistic, have investigated the accusation, and reject it. Lefranc and Doumergue, on Calvin's side, find no support for it; neither does Desmay or Le Vasseur, two Catholic clerical historians, contemporaries of Calvin and who wrote after his death. Two modern scholars, Kampschulte (Old-Catholic) and Paulus, likewise dismiss it as unworthy of credence. On the other hand, the story has the powerful support of such an authority as Cardinal Richelieu, as was found in a posthumous work of his published shortly after his death. The appearance of this work drew forth a defense of the reformer's character by Charles Drelincourt, published in Geneva, 1667. Calvin was charged, during his lifetime, with many crimes, including licentiousness and drunkenness. In that time of turmoil and excitement many charges were bandied about; and the reformers were just as liberal in the use of such weapons as other controversialists. But the specific charge that troubled Calvin's defenders then, and continues to trouble his defenders of to-day, was not one of that class. It was advanced by a contemporary of his, a Carmelite friar named Bolsec, who had been in apostasy for some years as a result of the reformers' propaganda, but who was ultimately received back into the Church. It was to the effect that an investigation into Calvin's early life, by one Berte-lier, officially acting for the Genevan authorities, disclosed that he had been "convicted of heinous moral turpitude, the punishment of which was then death by fire, but that the Bishop of Noyon had commuted the extreme penalty into branding a fleur-de-lys with a red-hot iron, as a perpetual mark of infamy, on the future reformer's shoulder." Professor Walker sums up the historical evidence and declares Calvin acquitted. But it must not be forgotten that when

Bolsec gave out the story he was again a member of the Catholic priesthood, and writing under a full sense of the responsibility of his words as well as under the sense that there were those in Geneva as well as in Noyon who could bear effective witness to the truth or the falsehood of his charge, as the truth of the case demanded. This fact should be taken in conjunction with the confession of the author of this new biography that he is unable to account satisfactorily for the causes that led to Calvin's arrest at Noyon. While the ostensible cause was "uproar made in the church" (at Noyon), there is nothing to show that the uproar was due to Calvin's preaching. Lang, a German historian, ventures to guess it was because of an attempt on Calvin's part to proclaim Evangelical doctrine; but this defense is set aside by another of Calvin's defenders, Doumergue, who points out that "such action would have been little in consonance with his (Calvin's) character." So that, whatever the truth as to the tremendous accusation be, it is clear that at that epoch there was very little about this particular reformer to entitle him to be classified as one fit for the Valhalla wherein the "heroes of the Reformation" are installed as perpetual sub-divinities. *A deus ex machina*, to solve this riddle, was found by two of Calvin's apologists. Desmay and Le Vasseur combined in putting forward a statement to the effect that during Calvin's residence in Geneva, another John Calvin, having no connection with the heresiarch, had been disciplined by the Chapter at Noyon because of a breach of the law of chastity, less heinous than that charged by Bolsec.

Calvin fled from Paris as soon as he could find means to do so, when the Parlement and the University began a prosecution for heresy against his friend and fellow-reformer, Nicholas Cop, because of a bold address he had delivered defending the theory of justification by faith alone and welcoming persecution, if it should come, for the sake of conscience and righteousness. Calvin was in no such stern frame of mind. He wanted no persecution, though he preferred the new views to the old; so he ran away, and wandered about the country, in various disguises, until he finally settled down in Switzerland, there to set up a new religion and a new form of civil government as a corollary of this new creed.

A spirit of heresy and rebellion may be said to have "run in the family" as regards the Calvins, or Cauvins, as they were styled in their native *habitat*, the village of Pont l'Eveque, and Noyon, whither they had migrated. Gérard Cauvin, the father of the reformer, was a sort of ecclesiastical lawyer or notary in Noyon, and utilized that position, as well as his influence as an admitted member of the bourgeoisie of Noyon, to secure ecclesiastical positions, with considerable emoluments in each case, for three sons, Antoine, Charles and

John. But gratitude seems not to have been a conspicuous element in the family character, for Gérard Cauvin became sour over legal matters and others toward the Chapter at Noyon, through whose favor those valuable plums had dropped into his children's hands, and his conduct became so obstreperous that the Bishop was obliged to excommunicate him; and in this state of reprobation he died. In a similar state died his son Charles, who, although an ecclesiastical student, was of a most violent and quarrelsome disposition, and vented his temper on his benefactors, the clergy of the Noyon Chapter. He was heretical, too, in his opinions, and for this he was tried and excommunicated. A third son, Antoine, also a beneficiary of the Chapter's liberality, brought deep chagrin and scandal on the reformer by bringing, in Geneva, while John was autocrat there, a charge of adultery against his (Antoine's) wife. The partner of her guilt was none other than Calvin's own secretary, Pierre Dagnet; and to crown Calvin's mortification, his own step-daughter, Judith, was, a little time after this scandal got ventilation, prosecuted and convicted for a similar crime. Antoine had meanwhile outraged public feeling—at that time not fully educated up to one logical result of Luther's and Calvin's teaching—namely, the divorce habit—by marrying again. These shocks in his family—a family supposed to be protected from temptation by the stern sanctity of a great reformer's contact and influence—were too much for his proud and irritable mind; and he was compelled to withdraw for some time from Geneva and court the solitude of the country until the gossip over his step-daughter's disgrace had died away. What was the fate or punishment of the erring girl the narrative does not say. Perhaps she died in prison.

The coldness with which Calvin wrote to his friend, Duchemin, when announcing the fact of his father's (Calvin's) death is a circumstance that even his biographers and apologists cannot overlook. He had been a loving parent to his children and never missed an opportunity of advancing their worldly fortunes by all the influence he possessed. If these sons and their parent had lived in our day they would have probably earned the reputation of being "grafters," as such are popularly called—since for the most part the positions they held were little if anything different from sinecures. These sinecures the sons continued to hold—and they were church benefices of considerable value—as absentees, all the time they were trying to undermine the Church which conferred them—until the very last moment they were permitted to do so. Loftiness of principle, therefore, does not seem to be a necessary consequence of independence in religious thought—at least in the case of many of the sixteenth century "reformers." The biographer seems to have been struck

with the difficulty of his task, as he followed the devious developments of Calvin's life. He comments upon the seeming callousness of Calvin toward his dead parent, while addressing his friend Duchemin, to whom he was communicating the tidings, in almost extravagant terms of endearment; but the entire absence of explanation or apology for such seemingly unfilial behavior speaks volumes for the author's difficulty. Similarly with regard to his apology for Calvin's careful measures for keeping himself out of danger when the aggressions of the reformers compelled King Francis to take measures against those fanatical iconoclasts. Calvin waited until he was beyond the reach of the French law before fulminating his thunders against the French monarch; then he became sublime, only to become again ridiculous when he himself, more powerful than any monarch, in Geneva, legislated against "heretics" and put such down with flame and fagot and excommunication edicts, precisely as the French Government tried to do.

Difficult as was the biographer's task in sugaring over these vacillations and contradictions, it was trifling as compared with those he encounters when he endeavors to account for the method by which Calvin reasoned himself into his system of religious belief. It is a labyrinth of contradictions. Denying that fallen man can do anything of himself, he yet for himself claimed the power to establish a new church and a new creed. His system destroys the necessity for man doing anything for himself. His present biographer puts it: "Calvin's severe logic, insistent that all salvation is independent of merit, led him to assert that damnation is equally antecedent to and independent of merit. The lost do indeed deserve their fate, but 'if we cannot assign any reason for His bestowing mercy on His people but just that it so pleases Him, neither can we have any reason for His reprobating others but His will.'" What became of the theory of "justification by faith" when this formula was announced? Of what use is a man's faith if his place is predetermined among the outcasts of Divine favor? No wonder the Buddhist and the Mahometan laugh at the Christian theory of salvation when presented under the appalling guise designed by this "hero of the Reformation!"

This system, leaving out of consideration completely the Catholic doctrine of free will in man, proves a very hard nut for Calvin's present biographer to crack—so hard, indeed, that he shrinks from any attempt whatever to do so. He merely says of the problem that "whether it leaves God a moral character, it is perhaps useless to inquire," but that there can be no question that Calvin and his disciples drew from the doctrine of election "much comfort." But how those who were profoundly "convinced of their own sinfulness," as

he further asserts those early reformers were, could reason themselves into the belief that heaven had been, before all ages, reserved for them and their congeners, without any merit of their own to show for such a gain, is a mystery of logic that the biographer leaves entirely to the reader to solve as best he can.

In his farewell address to the Genevan Ministers, just before his death, Calvin reiterated in words this marvelous and most dismal doctrine. "I have had many faults which you have had to endure," he said, "and all that I have done is of no value. The wicked will seize upon that word, but I repeat that all I have done is of no value, and that I am a miserable creature." This declaration, taken in conjunction with his own assertion, as well as that of numerous witnesses, that he was convinced that his work—the work he had been doing in Geneva—was the work of God, completes the anomaly. Joy, not misery of mind, was the natural mark of those true saints who felt that they had a call to do the work of God. No wonder there arose an Ingersoll and that the world is pockmarked with his cynical philosophy to-day!

Calvin had not received holy orders in the Catholic Church. He had held benefices, and was a recipient of their income, but at heart a rebel against the source whence they were derived. But when the time came when he had to make a choice between ordination or recusancy, he took the plunge that he had been long meditating, and constituted himself a priest according to his own notions of the exalted office. When he fled from Paris he took refuge, amongst other hiding places, in Poitiers, and there gathered a little company of kindred spirits about him. He constituted himself the leader, it would seem, and set up a new "cave of Adullam," not merely in a figurative sense, but almost literally. These members of the family of "the elect" met in a cavern outside the city, and there, according to Florimond de Ræmond, Calvin "observed the Lord's Supper." The ceremony was destructive and at the same time reconstructive. He "denounced the Roman Mass," and then said, "Brethren, let us eat the Lord's bread in memory of His death and passion." This is the order in which the biographer places the reference to those awful events—death first, passion next. The transposition is significant—not in itself, but as an indication of the confusion of mind which exists as to the real import of the sacrament and the necessity for perfect accuracy as to the procedure and detail in the observance of the commemoration, in certain sects.

Calvin's view of the great sacrament of the Catholic Church was purely rationalistic. It was clearly stated in the work he called the "Institutes." Acknowledging that "it is something spiritual," he goes on to explain that the nature of a physical body precludes it

from being in more than one place at the same moment. Such a plea entirely excludes the factor of the power of God, in physical things as in the spiritual realm. It denies the fact on which the whole Christian system is founded. It limits the power of the Creator to deal with His own creation.

In considering Calvin's awful temerity in thus setting himself up in the most absolute contradiction to the practice and teaching of the Apostles who partook of the sacrament from Christ's own hands, and of the Fathers of the early Church, the heresiarch, it has to be remembered, was face to face with his own objection as to the Church and the Scriptures. He stood on the authority of the Word of God alone, brushing aside with one imperious motion the authority of the Church and the validity of his own objection to the same. In the preface to his "Institutes" he put his position thus (preface to the French edition, A. D. 1541, Beveridge's translation, quoted by this biographer): "Although the Holy Scriptures contain a perfect doctrine, to which nothing can be added, . . . still every person, not intimately acquainted with them, stands in need of some guidance and direction as to what he ought to look for in them."

Such a guidance and direction the Church claimed, by Divine charter, to exercise. But this great individual denied boldly such a right in anybody but his own self, not even conceding the claims of any of the other "reformers" to interpret the Word of God aright. Majestic audacity truly!

The story of this first "Mass" of Calvin's is not given as authoritative by the biographer, but it is accepted as probably correct, since the transaction completely harmonized with the practice and precept of the apostate in later days in Geneva. The biographer appears to be at some loss how to account for so marvelous an assumption of power. "Calvin had never been ordained in the Roman Church," he observes; "he was never to be set apart for the ministry by the imposition of Protestant hands. He regarded his pastoral labors as a task to which he was called of God—a call witnessed by his own clear consciousness of the Divine guidance in appointing him his course of life." Pastoral labors! John Alexander Dowie's claim to be a pastor is precisely as valid as John Calvin's was when he had the frightful presumption to imitate or commemorate the action of the Saviour of mankind in instituting the sacrament which he gave as a seal to His Church for all the ages.

The reader turns away from the contemplation of such a horror in egotistical presumption to behold the victim of persecution, as Calvin believed himself to be, becoming in turn the relentless and treacherous persecutor himself. His dealings with Servetus are frankly set forth in this book, and it is gratifying to note that they are neither

palliated nor minimized. That episode is unparalleled as an instance of baseness and deliberate murder. The proof that Calvin had predetermined to have the life of his adversary is complete.

Says the biographer: "The greatest injustice to Calvin's memory would be to minimize his share in a tragedy which, however repugnant to modern thinking, was to him the exercise of a conscientious duty to the Church and a means of triumph, at the same time, over his enemies." But the reader is admonished to endeavor to look at the tragedy from the viewpoint of sixteenth century ideas. How thoughtful on the biographer's part! No such admonition is ever heard when it happens to be some incident of a Catholic monarch's reign that is being discussed. Trials like those of Huss and Zwingli are always considered as historical incidents apart from any relation to particular period or prevalent methods in procedure. The main fact to be remembered, before entering on a survey of Calvin's conduct in this memorable transaction, is the letter he himself drew up and addressed to the King of France on the subject of persecution for conscience' sake. This famous letter was an answer to a proclamation issued by Francis giving the reasons which compelled him to adopt repressive measures against his Protestant subjects—very cogent reasons surely, since it was either anarchy or the King's rule that was the issue created by the action of these injured Protestants. The posting of placards against the Mass by them had been followed in many parts of the country by violent outbreaks and bloody riots. Francis charged the instigators with the design of "overthrowing all things," and added that any government was bound to resist "a contagious plague that looked toward the foulest sedition." Calvin's reply complained that because he and his confrères put their hopes in God, and because they believed it to be "life eternal" to know the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent, they were cruelly persecuted. "For this hope some of us are in bonds, some beaten with rods, some made a gazing-stock, some proscribed, some most cruelly tortured, some obliged to flee; we are all pressed with poverty, loaded with dire execrations, lacerated with abuse and treated with the greatest indignity. . . . But if the whispers of the malevolent so possess your ears that the accused are to have no opportunity of pleading their cause; if those vindictive juries, with your connivance, are always to rage with bonds, scourgings, tortures, maimings and burnings, we indeed, like sheep doomed to slaughter, shall be reduced to every extremity," and so on. The reader is not conjured to recall the period when perusing this mournful threnody, but left to ponder, with no mitigating circumstances, on the cruelty of the punishments meted out to pious persons who had been impelled to riot and murder by the promptings of their protesting consciences!

Turn we now to the conditions which were created by the writer of this eloquent protest when he himself held the reins of power. Calvin, denouncing the Pope, constituted himself more than a Pope at Geneva. The ecclesiastical constitution which he got promulgated and put into force there was based upon the declaration that the office of teacher was of Divine appointment, that he might "educate the faithful in sound doctrine." He was the divinely appointed teacher—neither elected nor selected, but simply there by virtue of his own good will and nomination. His position was thus somewhat akin to that of Mahomet: "There is one God—and Mahomet is His prophet."

The machinery by which this system of theocracy was operated was rather complicated, but its principle was the support of the spiritual law by the strong arm of the State. There was a Consistory coöperating with Calvin, whose function it was to exercise a rigid censorship over the public morality and the private life of the entire body of the citizens. The powers of this inquisition—for such, indeed, was its real character—were tremendous. They were based on a set of Ordonnances drawn up by Calvin and passed by the city authorities after a rigid examination and discussion of their intent and scope. They were intended to stamp out heresy, to have Calvinism established as the law of the little State, to compel the attendance of all the people at the various churches at frequent services, to hold defaulters to account, to punish cases of immorality. With the Consistory coöperated the Little Council, a body of two hundred members, who exercised control over the police force of the city. The Consistory was to keep up the appearance of a purely spiritual authority; to the Little Council was delegated the task of dealing with the recalcitrant and wielding the punitive power of the State. When the refractory or indifferent proved obdurate under inquisitorial rebuke, they were formally excommunicated, and their subsequent treatment was left to the Little Council.

Calvin had contrived to get many formidable opponents removed from the field—the leaders of the two parties known respectively as the "Artichauds" and the "Guillermains." These had all been driven out of the city, after violent wrangles and free fights, or else had died or given out from the strenuosity of the struggle. Under these circumstances the introduction of the theocratic system proved much easier than it must necessarily have been had those reformers of different views but equal sternness with himself been enabled to continue their protests against his extreme doctrines. This system was not an empty name. It was set up for serious business, and this determination became evident from the first day of its installation. We gain an idea of the nature and extent of its operations from some

statistics collected by the author out of the "Registres du Consistoire" and the "Registres du Conseil" of Geneva, as well as from other official sources.

"The Consistory," the author writes, "began its work promptly. No age or distinction exempted any one from its censures. Men and women were examined as to their religious knowledge, their criticisms of ministers, their absences from sermons, their use of charms, their family quarrels, as well as to more serious offenses. Other examples, from the later activity of the Consistory in Calvin's time, show disciplinary procedure against a widow who had prayed a "requiescat in pace" on her husband's grave; for having fortunes told by gypsies; against a goldsmith for making a chalice; for saying that the incoming of French refugees had raised the cost of living and that a minister had declared that all those who had died earlier (*i. e.*, before the Reformation) were damned; for dancing; for possessing a copy of the "Golden Legend;" against a woman of seventy who was about to marry a man of twenty-five; against a barber for tonsuring a priest; for declaring the Pope to be a good man; making a noise during the sermon; laughing during preaching; criticizing Geneva for putting men to death on account of differences in religion; having a copy of "Amadis des Gaules;" or singing a song defamatory of Calvin. These are only a few typical instances. They give, however, a vivid picture of the iron rule of the persecuted gentleman who had so eloquently apostrophized the King of France on behalf of liberty of conscience and the rights of the iconoclasts to tear down images and trample on the sacred things of the altar. "The more flagrant faults detected by the Consistory were called by it to the attention of the magistrates; while really serious cases of crime and of error in doctrine appear to have received direct judicial cognizance without Consistorial intervention. In their dealings with the accused, whether brought to them from the Consistory or in the ordinary course of justice, the magistrates acted with great severity. Torture was freely used, as in most European States of that day. There seems to be adequate ground to hold that Calvin's influence increased the rigors with which occasional penal cases had been handled, . . . and it is to his credit that he made a successful protest against the cruelty with which death sentences were executed; but when this has been said, it must be equally recognized that Calvin's spirit favored the full and stringent execution of the laws and the increase of penalties for offenses having to do with breaches of chastity and similar infringements of moral order." (Making whips for the backs of some of his own household, as we have seen.) "The sum total of persons punished and the breadth of the incidence of punishment were doubtless very considerably augmented under

his influence. Between 1542 and 1546 fifty-eight persons were condemned to death and seventy-six to banishment; but it must be remembered that the frightful panic of 1545, which alleged the plague to have been spread by witchcraft and conspiracy, and led to thirty-four executions, falls in this period."

There was rebellion against this sort of "liberty of conscience" and "constitutional rule," such as Calvin desired in the case of France. The Council of Sixty protested against the arbitrary action of the Consistory, in the year 1543, but Calvin was that time too strongly intrenched in power to be shaken by the half-hearted. He was surrounded by a band of preachers or "ministers" as fanatical as himself and as unscrupulous about doing to others what they would not have done to themselves, as he, the high-priest of a new sort of Spartanism.

And here the reference to the plague of 1545 comes in most opportunely to illustrate the Divine simile touching the true shepherd and the hireling. Let us see what this biographer says about the behavior of those saintly teachers who so freely sent men to the fire and into exile for disagreement with Calvin's new theology and practice. It is instructive in the last degree.

"Nor did this ministry," writes the biographer, "strenuous in its demands as Calvin could make it, command the full respect of the community. The plague . . . reached Geneva in the autumn of 1542. Blanchet courageously offered his services at the hospital, where the magistrates required a minister; but such was the reluctance of his colleagues that Calvin felt, not without apprehension, that should Blanchet die he must step into the breach, lest the members of his flock be left unconsolated in their extremity. The test soon came. In April, 1543, the plague broke out again, and before the month was over the Little Council ordered the ministers to send one of their number to the hospital. They all shrank back. It was reported to the Council that some declared they 'would rather be with the devil.'"

Blanchet did fall a victim, and the Little Council ordered the ministers to choose a successor at the hospital, passing over Calvin, as he was deemed or claimed to be "necessary to the Church." Five days later the ministers went before the Council and cravenly confessed their cowardice. While recognizing the task as a duty, they declared that "God had not yet given them grace to have force and constancy to go to the hospital," thereby placing the blame for their base betrayal of trust on the shoulders of the Almighty. Calvin's friend and pupil, Beza, endeavors to maintain that Calvin accepted exemption from the dangerous service only with reluctance; but the biographer finds nothing in the contemporary records, he candidly

acknowledges, to support this apology. On the other hand, when popular superstition had worked the public mind into a panic over the plague, Calvin did nothing to check the fury that impelled the seizure of suspected dealers in witchcraft, as engaged in a conspiracy to destroy human life. The rage for blood and cruelty was not sated until thirty-four victims had perished in Geneva, under the most agonizing forms of torture that human malignity can devise. Calvin believed the charges of witchcraft and conspiracy to be facts, as his biographer admits. He pleaded, no doubt, for less cruel forms of execution; but he should not have pleaded, if he were really humane; he should have commanded—for none durst say him nay. The cruel tortures inflicted upon one of his antagonists in the city, a freethinker named Gruet—antecedent to his execution for an offense of a trivial character were it not that it personally concerned Calvin—seem to give proof that his pleas for mitigation of torture were insincere.

It was amidst such conditions that the controversy between Calvin and Servetus arose, to stamp the reign of the theocrat as animated by a spirit as merciless and more treacherous than any civil rule save perhaps that of the English Queen, Elizabeth.

Servetus, or as his Spanish cognomen had it Serveto (Miguel) was a scholar and scientist about Calvin's own age. He resembled Calvin in having a temper impatient of contradiction, and he had an exceedingly bitter tongue and pen when controversy was the order of the day. He began to take a part in religious disputation at a very early age. At twenty he produced a book called "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*," full of Socinian theory or teaching. This treatise aroused a storm, being condemned as heretical by Protestants no less than Catholics. He met Calvin in Paris, while he was, under the assumed name of Villeneuve, taken from his birthplace in Aragon, studying medicine and natural sciences. Calvin challenged him to a public controversy over his book, but Servetus was too wary to fall into such a dangerous trap; he declined, and kept on at his medical and scientific work. He was so keen a student and practical observer in these pursuits that he anticipated Harvey in the discovery of the circulation of the blood by three-quarters of a century. This was the sort of man that Calvin made up his mind to put out of the world if ever he got him in his power, and carried out his determination only too well.

Servetus published another work in the year 1553, under the title "*Restitution of Christianity*." It was pantheistic in its propositions; and it rejected the theory of predestination and laid stress on the value of good works—the very antithesis of Calvin's teaching. Before sending the work to press he had sent slips of his MS. to Calvin, in return for a copy of the "*Institutes*" sent him by the Geneva auto-

crat. Servetus returned the copy, with some terribly sarcastic criticism on the margins of various pages; and this was the drop that filled the cup of bitterness to overflowing. Calvin wrote to his friend Farel, in 1546, that should Servetus ever come to Geneva, as he had intimated he might, he should never go back from that place alive, if he (Calvin) had authority to prevent it. The letter is part of the author's authority for his biography: no one challenges it.

Here, again, was the very wrong of which the letter to King Francis made complaint—the condemnation of men unheard in their own defense. This seems to have been Calvin's habit while he held sway in Geneva. "Servetus, to Calvin's thinking," writes the biographer, "destroyed the Christian hope; and, repulsive as it seems to the modern man, he deemed it his duty to rid the world of such 'impiety,' should the opportunity be his, and Servetus still be unrepentant of his 'errors.'" The opportunity did not arise until several years had elapsed. But he watched for it with the patience of a cat for a mouse.

In 1553 he secured a copy of the "Restitution," then just secretly printed at Vienne, in France. A letter about the book passed between Antoine Arneys, a cousin of Guillaume Trie's, one of Calvin's close friends, and by some unexplained reason it got into the hands of the authorities at Lyons. Prosecution of Servetus was ordered as a consequence; and the legal authorities were furnished by Trie with a number of Servetus' letters to Calvin as well as the annotated copies of the "Institutes." Who furnished this evidence? The author says that many scholars believe that it was Calvin, but says on the other hand that other scholars reject the theory. The circumstantial evidence points to Calvin as the instigator of the proceedings against Servetus in France. The author thinks so, evidently.

Legal proceedings were begun in Vienne in the month of April and lasted until June, 1553. They terminated in a sentence of death by slow fire; but this fate was not to be carried out there, for Servetus had escaped from the prison, somehow, and made his way to Geneva, *en route* for Naples. He was recognized by Calvin while listening to one of his sermons, was arrested, and lodged in prison. Calvin felt that "he had been delivered into his hands," says the biographer, "and that he (Calvin) ought to prevent further 'contagion.' From the first Calvin hoped that Servetus would forfeit his life, for he wrote to his friend Farel: 'I hope the judgment will be capital, in any event, but I desire cruelty of punishment withheld.'"

There was more at stake than the mere condemnation of heresy. Calvin's position in Geneva, at that time, had become exceedingly shaky. His popularity had been on the wane since the time of the plague. Therefore there was some sort of sympathy with his in-

tended victim among the citizens. At the hearing of the case on August 16th hot words were exchanged between Philibert Berthelier, representing the Lieutenant of Justice, and Calvin's counsel, Colladon. It was made evident that the case was to test the relative strength of rival parties in Geneva and the permanency of Calvin's control. Berthelier represented his bitter foes. "The condemnation of Servetus became vital to Calvin's Genevan status," says the biographer. He therefore appeared in person against the accused. This fact lends a still darker color to the whole villainous transaction. The case assumed the character of a personal issue between two differing theologians rather than a question of the vindication of eternal truths.

The doctrinal duel between the two scholars took on a very technical character. Calvin pushed Servetus hard in his attack. He made him avow his pantheistic belief to its last logical position—that the very floor and benches of the court house were of the "substance of God." "Then," triumphantly exclaimed his antagonist, "the Devil is God in substance also;" to which, unfortunately for himself, Servetus replied with a mocking query: "Do you doubt it?" This question proved his ruin, in the end.

The dispute proceeded for a long time. The judges, very fairly, decreed that the presentation of the charges against Servetus, and his replies thereto, should be made in the Latin tongue—a fact that gives overwhelming testimony to the importance of that language as a strictly scientific medium. Fiery words passed between the two hot-tempered champions. Servetus called his accuser liar, cheat, fool, scoundrel; and compared him to Simon Magus, one of confused mind who barked like a dog, hoping thus to overwhelm the judges.

Several times, owing to the fierce opposition of Berthelier, the case seemed to be on the point of going against Calvin; but after much wavering the scale turned in his favor. A verdict of guilty and a sentence of death by burning were the final outcome. Calvin interposed with a request for a less cruel form of execution, but the court paid no heed to it. Perhaps they did not regard it as put seriously.

The victim died courageously, forgiving his enemies and imploring Jesus to have mercy on his soul. A monument to his memory was erected on the spot where he perished, three years ago. It is a monument to Calvin's disgrace no less than to the fortitude of the sufferer.

In "The Prince" Machiavelli vindicates the right of the ruler to place himself even above "the law," should he deem the emergency calls for such a stretch of extreme power. This bold doctrine was adopted and acted on by Calvin, as ruler of Geneva, at times—notably

in this case of Servetus. He went outside his own bailiwick to get him into his clutches. His "law" was freedom of conscience while he was struggling with Francis in earlier years; this principle was cast to the winds when his own time came to wield the wand of power. Out of his own mouth he stands condemned. The red stain of cruel, premeditated murder is on his tombstone, to remain there while the world endures.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia, Pa.

SOME CANADIAN PROBLEMS.

"The Loyalty of French Canada," *The Quarterly Review*, October, 1896.

"French Canadian Migration," *The Month*, November, 1893.

"New France in 1894," *Ibid*, March, 1894.

TO THE question, Are Canadians loyal to England? the answer must be: Yes, for the time being. That is to say that, since self-interest is the ultimate motive of all loyalty, it is to the interest of Canadians, French as well as English, to be loyal to a power which, in a very real sense, even if unconsciously, holds the balance between them. It is this interest which the problems herein to be discussed most nearly affect.

The main problem, while it may be stated in three words—the Race Issue—goes back to the very beginnings of Canadian history, and has its roots in the age-long struggle between English Puritan and French Catholic for the mastery of the American continent. It is a problem which was complicated rather than simplified by the apparent victory of the one side and the apparent defeat of the other. It is the merest truism to say that the one aim of the French Canadian from 1760 to the present day has been to regain the supremacy which he seemed to lose when New France became a British colony. That, in a word, is the real significance of the race issue in Canada. All other problems are of minor importance.

In order, however, for the English reader to understand the real bearing of this problem on Canadian loyalty, it is necessary that he should bear in mind that which was just now said as to its origin and its long continuance. Further, that he should recognize clearly that the conquest of Quebec in 1760 was the beginning of American independence. It was the fear of French aggression more than all other motives combined which kept the American colonies loyal to England. Once that fear was removed by the conquest of New

France, the colonists had leisure to discover their intolerable grievances, which assumed an entirely new aspect. The victory, as already stated, was more apparent than real. The conquered population largely outnumbered those of the victors, who took up their residence in Canada; the Treaty of Paris and the Quebec Act of 1774, followed by similar imperial legislation, left the French Canadians, for all practical purposes, better off than they had ever been before.

This, then, may be taken as the beginning of the race issue in Canada as a British colony, the various phases of which in the past there is, of course, no necessity to follow out here in historical detail. We may note, though, in passing that discontent on both sides showed itself from the outset, culminating in the rebellion of 1837. The legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada was and could only be a temporary expedient at the very best, but it taught the two races some measure of mutual respect at least, if it did not tend to engender mutual affection.

At Confederation, in 1867, the population of Quebec if it did not outnumber, certainly equaled that of the other three original provinces. Moreover, the number of members in the Federal House of Commons assigned to Quebec, namely, sixty-five, was not only made a permanent provision, but was also fixed as the basis of representation for the Dominion as a whole, whatever its subsequent growth or population might be.

It is here that we encounter the first of the minor problems arising out of the race issue, the status, namely, of Quebec in the Federal House of Commons. The inclusion of Manitoba, in 1870, did not materially affect the advantage derived from the command of a potential majority on all racial questions, but the gradual growth of population in Ontario and the west has slowly but surely shifted the balance of power, and what is known in political parlance as "a solid Quebec" has become more than ever vitally necessary, not for the preservation of a predominance to which the French of Canada hold themselves entitled, but also, as it seems to them, of their liberties and privileges, if not of their very existence as a race, certainly of their due place in the political life of the Dominion.

Prior, however, to 1890, the vote of Quebec was, generally speaking, fairly evenly divided between the two great political parties. The Manitoba school law of that year, by depriving the French minority of privileges which they had enjoyed for twenty years, roused the French of Quebec, in some measure at least, to a sense of possible danger. The election of 1896 turned frankly on a nationalist issue and was decided mainly by the personality of a great French Canadian statesman—Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The

wholly natural desire to see one of their own race Premier of the Dominion outweighed with the French of Quebec all other considerations, all claims of party loyalty. Sir Wilfrid's victory, his place at the head of affairs, typified the supremacy at which they had always aimed. The two elections which have since taken place have more than confirmed the verdict of the first, and a "solid Quebec" of some fifty-odd votes is an accomplished political fact.

Such an obvious advance towards French domination could not, of course, be without a corresponding effect on the other elements of the population, on the Protestants of Ontario most of all. But it is one of the most curious minor problems connected with this primary one that the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion, Irish chiefly, should side, not with those of their own faith, but with those of their own speech; that language, not religion, should constitute the line of cleavage. To what extent this is carried will be shown at the end of this article, when certain local symptoms, as they may be called, come to be discussed. For the moment we must concern ourselves with the actual possibilities of French supremacy.

The Manitoba school act of 1890, already referred to, showed the French of that province to be in a hopeless minority even then, which twenty years of immigration, largely American, has only tended to render more hopeless. The fact is all the more remarkable when it is compared with another, namely, that there are some two million French Canadians in the New England factory towns. Without entering into all the causes which led to so vast a migration south-eastward rather than northwestward, to the factory rather than to the farm, and which are discussed in the article on "French Canadian Migration," I may be permitted to allude briefly to the most important, which I take to be: First, the unsuitability of Northern Quebec for small farmer colonization; secondly, over-population in the inhabited and easily habitable districts of the province; thirdly, the modern trend of rural population citywards. Farming in Quebec labors under many disadvantages, climatic and other, whereas the factories seem to offer a comparatively easy means of making money. But whatever the causes, the stream of migration set in the direction indicated, and the French in Manitoba and the Northwest remained and must continue to remain an insignificant minority in the midst of population alien in speech and for the most part in faith.

The result, so far as a possible French domination is concerned, seems to the dispassionate observer sufficiently obvious. Twenty-five years ago a new Quebec, with a population of over a million in the Northwest, was a political possibility; had it become a fact, the fate of Ontario, if not of Canada, in such an event is not difficult to

guess at. To-day a new Quebec is as visionary a land as Utopia; the French Canadians, to use their own expression, *ont manqué leur coup*. French supremacy in Canada is no longer within the range of practical possibilities.

The realization of this, if, indeed, he can be said to have realized it, does not, of course, tend to make the French Canadian amiably disposed towards his fellow-citizens of English speech, if local symptoms may be trusted. It is at the capital of all places that the two "nationalities" come into closest contact and into keenest rivalry. The boast, "You have built up a country and we mean to rule it," may be dismissed as the vamping of hot-headed youth; yet, unfortunately, the youth in question forms, or will form, the great mass of local voters at the next Federal election, and will vote "solid" on "national" lines, regardless of all else. It is thus, in fact, that Quebec thinks and dreams; aims at nothing less than supremacy—or annexation to the States.

This, if it can be called a minor problem, is of the very essence of the Canadian situation; is the determining factor in respect of Canadian loyalty. Against a solid Quebec there is, or soon will be, an equally solid Ontario, at least an irreparable cleavage along the line of speech. And the complete victory of either must, it would seem, supply the answer to the question concerning the loyalty of Canada to the empire. For the time being it is to the interest of each to retain the good-will of a fairly impartial umpire. An unfair decision or a marked turning of the scale in one direction or the other would have consequences not easy to estimate.

The unfair decision may, however, be dismissed as wholly unlikely, if not impossible. The turning of the scale against the French is, as matters stand, certainly a very remote contingency, since a solid Quebec of fifty to sixty-five votes is a force which any party in power must of necessity take into account for many years to come. Nor need Quebec fear "English domination" in the local sense, seeing that the divergent interests, political and material, of the provinces which go to make up a potential solid west must always militate against its effectual formation. Quebec, in fact, is to all intents and purposes a homogeneous entity; the west is not and never can be. Moreover, the maritime provinces are no more likely to side with their western rivals than they are to take the part of Quebec. A collision between Quebec and the west would, on the face of it, be the opportunity of the maritime provinces, which have also their own ambitions in the direction of leadership if not of supremacy.

The situation may therefore be stated thus: The race issue is the dominant problem of Canadian affairs; the rivalry, that is, between those of French and those of English speech for supremacy. In-

timately connected with this main problem are certain lesser ones, such as the balance of power in the Federal House of Commons, the lost opportunity of a new Quebec in the northwest, the growing resentment of Ontario and the west against the political domination of a solid Quebec and the attitude of the Irish Catholics. To these must be added the friction and exacerbation of constant contact at Ottawa and the recurrent tendency of Quebec to look to annexation as a remedy for ills that seem otherwise incurable.

That there are thousands of French Canadians of the younger generation especially who regard annexation to the United States, under certain conditions, as preferable to "British domination"—defeat that is in the struggle for supremacy at Ottawa—can, it would seem, hardly admit of question, least of all with those who know the French Canadian as he is. The conditions, however, include so large an "if" as to remove this tendency also from the sphere of practical politics. The "if," in fact, is of no less an extent than that Quebec, as a State of the American Union, should retain all the civil, religious and legal privileges accorded by the various acts of the British Parliament, their language most of all. The terms have only to be stated in order to show their utter impossibility of fulfillment, but the tendency must be reckoned with; the umpire must take it into account.

But it is surely curious, to say the least of it, that the fear of French aggression which had so large a share in the loyalty of the American colonies should still be a determining if not a dominant element in the loyalty of English-speaking Canada. That it is so will hardly, on careful consideration of Canadian conditions, be questioned—unless, indeed, some motive more powerful than self-interest should be found for loyalty. Sentiment doubtless has its due place not readily to be defined, but self-interest is easily first. In this case it amounts to a reliance more or less unconscious and traditional on British support against an aggression which is both real and traditional. Yet it is no less curious and certainly noteworthy that there should also be a distinct, if unconscious, trust on the part of French Canadians in British justice and fair play, shown first in 1760 and not materially departed from since.

The "local symptoms" as to Irish Catholic sympathies may, in conclusion, be briefly alluded to as indicated when they were first referred to as one of the curious minor Canadian problems. Such sympathies are, naturally, most unmistakably shown at the capital of the Dominion, and are carried not only into Federal and provincial politics, but into religion and education, though these, indeed, have a very distinct political importance. In respect of the former it is hardly an exaggeration to say that an Irish Catholic would sooner

vote for an Orangeman than for a French Canadian co-religionist; certainly for an English-speaking Protestant. In respect of the latter, the existence of Irish and French churches in the same parish—on each side of the same street—and the long struggle for the control and possession of the local Catholic university, involving a very possible political retaliation at the next election, afford some indication of the cleavage resulting from differences of race and speech—differences which a common faith is practically powerless to heal. And, if so, what hope is there that these differences, aggravated by divergencies of faith, will grow less in Canada and not greater as time goes on?

FRANCIS W. GREY.

Ottawa, Canada.

ARE THE OTHER PLANETS INHABITED?

THE confident assertion is nowadays often made that besides the earth there are other planets of our solar system inhabited by man. In this paper we propose to examine the grounds of this statement.

The modern mind is often oppressed and sometimes overwhelmed by the immensity and complexity of that material universe which scientific research has so amply unfolded and revealed. Insignificant, indeed, does man seem and insignificant the earth, man's dwelling place, compared with the whole stupendous universe. Why, it is asked, should the Creator of all this matter and all this force, of all this wealth and magnificence of nature, take special interest in this "unfeathered, two-legged thing, man," weak of body, dark of mind, unstable of will, inhabitant of a minor planet shot off from a thir-rate sun? The laws of evolution, we are assured, that have produced man on earth, must also have produced him in countless other parts of the universe, and notably in the planets of our solar system. Hence, we are told, as there are probably in the whole universe as many man-inhabited worlds as there are men on earth, it is incredible that the Maker of them all deemed it worth His while to restrict the supernatural revelation of His will to earth-man, to load him with special favors, and then when flouted and disobeyed to die on the Cross in order to redeem the tiny rebel from the consequences of his own astounding folly. These are, however, but wild and whirling words unless upheld by cogent arguments and borne out by conclusive facts. What, then, are those

arguments? What are those facts? On examination we find that both facts and arguments are conspicuous mainly by their absence.

I.

First of all, the assumption that man was evolved on earth, and must therefore have also been evolved elsewhere, is but hypothesis proving hypothesis. For it is certain that the superior half of man, his spiritual soul, was not and could not have been evolved from matter. Again, it is an unproved hypothesis that even man's body was evolved from the brute creation. Moreover, even if man had been the product of evolution on earth, it would be infinitely improbable that he should also be the product of evolution on the other planets. For, according to the mechanical view of evolution, it was only through a long chapter of accidents that man ever came into existence at all on this globe of ours. Consequently the probability of the recurrence elsewhere of the special combination of most complex conditions required to beget and necessary to maintain the miracle of life on any other planet is so remote that it counts for nothing. The chances against its ever happening on earth were trillions to one. The chances against its recurring elsewhere were billions of trillions to one.

Take a parallel instance. Bandage a rifleman's eyes, spin him round time after time until he has no idea where the points of the compass are, then bid him fire off his musket at random. What chance is there that he will hit a shilling that has been hidden in the heather on a hillside a mile away? It is *possible* that he might hit it. For the bullet must strike something, and that something might be the shilling. But there is not the remotest probability. And if the blindfolded shooter should hit the shilling once, what chance would there be of his hitting it a second time? Yet that second hit would be incomparably more probable than the recurrence, outside the earth, of a man produced by evolution.

The odds against purposeless evolution begetting man are incalculably greater than the odds against the whist player drawing all the thirteen trumps. Yet the odds against this latter combination are 158,750,000,000 to 1! What are the odds, then, against the same player drawing all the trumps twice, or two hundred, or two thousand times? Then, what are the odds against the evolution of man in two, or two hundred, or two thousand worlds?

The immensity of the universe compared with the minuteness of man is rather an anthropomorphic difficulty, which when reduced to its due proportions turns out to be less than at the first blush appears. For the objection depends upon the comparison of the

great with the small. But is not this rather our human way of looking at things? In the eyes of the Infinite and All-powerful First Cause can anything finite be truly called either great or small? For all things, both great and small, He made out of nothing simply by willing their existence. He wished it, and they leaped into being. To the Creator it was as easy to make the molar mass of the Milky Way as to make the molecular mass of the hydrogen atom. Conversely, human power could as little produce the latter as the former; for the act of creation, whether of an atom or of the universe, is essentially an infinite act. To uphold in their orbits one thousand million Suns costs Him as much and as little trouble as to uphold a sparrow in its flight or a hair of your head from falling to the ground.

But, it is asked, what is the good of so gigantic a universe? An intelligent agent acts always to attain an object, to fulfil a purpose, and he proportions his means to the end in view. Yet if man be the climax of the universe, and the outer rind of this tiny earth be man's only dwelling-place, of what possible use are the myriad mightier orbs scattered throughout space? Where is the proportion between means and end? We cannot answer. Creation does, no doubt, fulfil the all-wise purpose of the Creator; but what that purpose may be no man can presume to say for certain. We can but guess.

There are, however, facts which, even if they fail to establish our guesses, serve at least to beget in us a cautious frame of mind. They reveal to us our ignorance; and that, as Socrates assured us, is a large gain. The knowledge of one's ignorance is the beginning of wisdom. For what sight can there be more grotesque than that of finite man, the "ephemeral" as Æschylus dubs him, the creature of a day, the heir to dusty death, dogmatizing about the purposes of his Maker and even denying the existence of God because the finite cannot fathom the intentions of the Infinite!

Among these facts just referred to as fitted to give us pause is this, that our solar system is probably the centre of creation, the hub of the universe. Luigi d'Auria, in a mathematical paper on "Stellar Motion," writes: "We have good reasons to suppose that the solar system is rather near the centre of the Milky Way; and this centre would coincide with the centre of the universe."¹ And that Nestor of scientists, even as he is the doyen of evolutionists, Alfred R. Wallace,² wrote a book to prove that the stellar universe forms one connected sphere; that the Milky Way is the equator of that sphere; that the solar system is situated in the plane of the

¹ *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, March, 1903.

² "Man's Place in the Universe," 2d ed., p. 317.

Milky Way, and not far removed from the centre of that plane. "Thus the earth is nearly in the centre of the stellar universe." Hence, as man is the climax of earth, so, too (as it would appear), is he the climax of the universe.

The main argument of those who maintain that other worlds possess inhabitants is this, that these worlds are useless as far as earth is concerned, and *must* therefore have been made for the habitation of non-terrestrial man. A very competent astronomer, J. E. Gore,³ says: "The suns which we call stars were clearly not created for our benefit. They are of very little practical use to the earth's inhabitants. They give us very little light. An additional small satellite—one considerably smaller than the moon—would have been much more useful in this respect than the millions of stars revealed by the telescope. They *must*, therefore, have been formed for some other purpose. We may, therefore, conclude"—that they are inhabited! And another critic,⁴ combating the view that our central position might be due to the fact that we were so placed in order to benefit to the utmost by the emanations of the stars, remarks that "we might wander into outer space without losing anything more serious than we lose when the night is cloudy and we cannot see the stars." He does not, however, acquaint us with the sources of his information. What the chemical and electrical effects of the star-emanations may be no man knows. But in face of modern discoveries—say of the powers of radium and of the X-rays—a discreet confession of ignorance would seem to be the wisest course to follow.

Let us repeat it that we neither know nor can know all the purposes of creation. Hence it is futile to affirm that this thing or that thing is objectless, and that the stupendous means are out of all proportion to the trivial end. For that is to assume that the end is trivial.

Suppose a monkey could watch the complicated processes employed in the making of a pin. The end of a pin, he might notice, is to fasten an orchid in your buttonhole! Yet what a disproportion between means and end! How he would wonder at these means—the busy factory, the complicated machinery, the crowds of work-folk, the sub-division of labor, the costly methods employed! Yet has man better data by which to condemn his Maker than the monkey has to condemn the pin manufacturer?

It is obvious on all sides that the Creator is most liberal, nay, lavish, in the means which he uses to attain His ends. For instance, what a vast number of spores one fern in its lifetime will produce;

³ "The Worlds of Space," c. III.

⁴ *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1903, p. 60.

yet of them all one only need fructify in order to replace the parent plant. What an astonishing quantity of ova one salmon, year after year, will bring forth; yet out of all these millions of eggs it is enough if but two come to maturity to supply the places of the male and female parent salmon. An oak tree bears annually thousands of acorns; yet it suffices if, after hundreds of years, but one acorn develops into an oak to take the place of its parent tree.

Similarly, why may not the Creator have made the primordial nebula prolific of countless worlds in order that one—the earth—might become the fit abode of man?

Man is certainly a small creature with a tiny brain. Nevertheless, by that brain he can mentally assimilate the whole universe. Man is limited to time and space; yet with his mind he can step outside both time and space to acquaint himself with eternity and infinity. Within the little sphere of man's head all creation may be summed up. On the tablets of his memory the history of all things can be written. Then why should not God have created, let us say, the furthest star if only for this purpose, that the astronomer might discover its existence and thereby raise his mind to a new act of praise, reverence and service of the Maker? For in that way "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork."⁵

Hence the universe would seem to have been only the workshop for the manufacture of man. Or, in another way, the universe would appear to be but man's home; a home richly decorated—both for profit and delight—with the most lavish magnificence of suns and systems, of mountains and oceans; adorned with the splendid luxuriance of plants, with countless wealth of animals, with untold variety of exquisite grace of bird and beast, of foliage and flower. Yes, all these things seem to have been made for man, since they can "tell God's glory" only by furnishing man with the means and the motive to glorify the Maker. For "glory" is "clear knowledge with praise," and the irrational creation can of itself neither know nor praise Him. Therefore the whole hierarchy of creation, animate and inanimate, lower than man seems to be like some mighty orchestra in a lone land, dumb until the fingers of man play upon its keys and the breath of man blows upon its vents, and then rich melodies resound amid the solitudes and the crash of mighty symphonies reverberate throughout the everlasting mountains.

Man, dowered with free will, capable of virtue and duty, of truth and self-sacrifice, of love and reverence, of merit and praise, of

⁵ Ps. xviii., 2.

⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 321-322.

service and honor; with a mind competent to embrace present, past and future, to range the limitless realms of time and space; with soul immortal, a being of infinite duration—such a one incomparably outweighs the whole irrational universe. Consequently it seems not improbable that all things were made for man, just as man was made for God.

On this theme Alfred Wallace⁶ writes: "All nature tells us the same strange, mysterious story of the exuberance of life, of endless variety, of unimaginable quantity. All this life upon our earth has led up to and culminated in that of man. It has been, I believe, a common and not unpopular idea that during the whole process of the rise and growth and extinction of past forms the earth has been preparing for the ultimate—Man.

"And is it not in perfect harmony with this grandeur of design, this vastness of scale, this marvelous process of development through all the ages that the material universe needed to produce this cradle of organic life (the earth), and of a being destined to a higher and a permanent existence, should be on a corresponding scale of vastness, of complexity, of beauty?

"Even if there were no such evidence as I have here adduced for the unique position and the exceptional characteristics which distinguish the earth, the old idea that all the planets were inhabited and that all the stars existed for the sake of other planets, which planets existed to develop life, would, in the light of our present knowledge, seem utterly improbable and incredible. It would introduce monotony into a universe whose grand character and teaching is endless variety. It would imply that to produce the living soul in the marvelous and glorious body of man—man with his faculties, his aspirations, his powers for good and evil—that this was an easy matter which could be brought about anywhere in the world. It would imply that man is an animal and nothing more, is of no importance in the universe, needed no great preparations for his advent. . . . Looking at the long, and slow, and complex growth of nature that preceded his appearance, the immensity of the stellar universe with its thousand million Suns, and the vast æons of time during which it has been developing—all these seem only the appropriate and harmonious surroundings; the necessary supply of material, the sufficiently spacious workshop for the production of that planet which was to produce, first the organic world and then Man."

II.

The argument is often adduced that because the Earth is inhabited by man, inhabited, too, by man must the other planets of the solar system be. Such reasoning, however, is not even specious. More-

ever, it can be retorted. For we know for certain that the moon is not inhabited, although she has the advantage of that proximity to the sun which the earth possesses. Why is it not then just as fair an inference that because the moon is not inhabited, neither are the other planets inhabited?

What scientific proof is there that other planets are inhabited? None. Dr. Wallace wrote: "The belief that other planets are inhabited has been generally entertained, not in consequence of physical reasons, but in spite of them."⁷

Sir Robert Ball expresses a like opinion:⁸ "I do not think it at all probable that a man could exist, even for five minutes, in any other planet, or on any other body in the universe. . . . Indeed, there seem to be innumerable difficulties in supposing that there can be any residence for man, or for any being nearly resembling man, elsewhere than on his own Earth."

But let us look into the matter a little more in detail. There are obviously here two separate and distinct questions for consideration:

First, is there any other planet, besides the earth, the combined and complex conditions of which fit it for the habitation of man?

Secondly, if there exist such a planet, is it *de facto* inhabited by man?

To prove the first would be by no means to establish the second. For if there were such a habitable planet, it might, nevertheless, remain uninhabited.

On the second question we need not dwell. For we know nothing, and can know nothing, about it. Why not? Because it is the assured teaching of science—a teaching as certain (according to Lord Kelvin) as the Law of Gravitation—that life is not evolved by natural causes, from brute matter, but comes only from antecedent life; that is, that life comes from without. Consequently, even if it could be proved that any other planet besides the earth were fitted for man's abode, before the scientist could validly affirm that man abides there he must first show that life has been introduced into that planet from some extrinsic source. And on that head he can have no information of any kind whatever.

At best, then, we can but dip into the first question, and discuss whether or not any other planet be habitable; that is, whether any other planet possesses that complicated combination of circumstances which alone would fit it for the habitation of man. And this it is worth our while to attempt. For though we cannot argue from habitable to inhabited, we can argue from non-habitable to non-inhabited. Yet even on this preliminary question we have but the

⁷ *Ibid.*, c. II., p. 7.

⁸ "In the High Heavens," 1893, c. II., p. 44.

scantiest information. Again Professor Ball⁹ writes: "Especially should we like to know whether the other planets are inhabited. But on this our greatest telescopes can give us no information whatever. We can only form the vaguest surmises."

Moreover, these "vaguest surmises" all lead to a negative reply.

We shall now, first of all, touch very briefly on the conditions necessary for life. Secondly, we shall consider how far those conditions are fulfilled on Earth. Thirdly, we shall examine to what extent those conditions are verified in the other planets of the Solar System.

III.

First, then, what are the necessary conditions of life?

Vital phenomena, in the main, appear between 32 degrees and 104 degrees Fahrenheit. The higher plants and animals cannot live perpetually with the thermometer below freezing-point; they would be frozen. They cannot live perpetually with the thermometer much above 100 degrees; they would be fried. On Earth the extremes of heat and cold are nowhere constant, but are diversified by the different seasons. Consequently no land animal passes its whole life in regions where the temperature never rises above the freezing-point. On the other hand, albumen, one of the proteids, and essential to life, coagulates at 160 degrees.

Again, life requires a due supply of solar light and heat. For there can be no land animals where there are no plants, and there can be, practically, no plants where there is not a fit proportion of sunlight and sun-heat.

Water, moreover, is an essential of life. It constitutes something like three-quarters of the body of a living thing. Neither plant nor animal can exist without it. And it must be always present in such quantities and so distributed as to be constantly available. Even a camel cannot live in a waterless Sahara, except so long as the supply which it brought with it lasts.

Besides this, life requires a suitable atmosphere. We live at the bottom of a vast ocean of air, and that ocean must be of high density and of right gases. Nor are these two conditions, in themselves, essentially connected. The density might be right, but the gases wrong. The gases might be right, but the density wrong.

The atmosphere must have a right density. For the atmosphere must be a cloak against excessive heat and a reservoir of heat against excessive cold. As a recipient and reservoir of heat, the atmosphere must be rather dense; not too dense to prevent the sun's rays from passing freely through to warm the earth, yet dense enough to act as

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 40.

a blanket at nighttime, so as to hinder the too rapid escape of the heat accumulated during the day. The heat stored up in the daytime must be given out at night in such quantities as to secure for night and day an approximate uniformity of temperature.

A rare atmosphere has a less capacity for storing heat, and allows of a more copious radiation; that is, loss of heat. Hence, to increase the rarity of the atmosphere is to decrease the temperature. On earth, at about three and a half miles high, our atmosphere has but half the density of that at sea-level. This altitude is considerably greater than the snow-line of the tropics, where, with a fierce heat at their base, there is perpetual snow at the breast of the mountains. Consequently an atmosphere of half the sea-level density of ours would render life, at least for man, a sheer impossibility, for the whole globe would lie buried in perpetual snow and ice. Evaporation from the ocean would indeed be more rapid than with us, but it would be constantly falling as snow, and as continually compacting into ice.

Again, the atmosphere must not only contain the right gases; it must also be a right mixture of the right gases. For the life of plants and of animals the gases, constituent of the air, must be as nicely balanced as are the air's density and temperature. There must be a due supply—neither too much nor too little—of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon and aqueous vapor. And the adjustment of these gases must be exact to a degree. Take two instances. In our atmosphere there is but one part of ammonia—a compound of nitrogen and hydrogen—to a million parts of air; yet this millionth part is essential to plants, for nitrogen they must have, and yet the free nitrogen of the air they are unable to assimilate into their tissues. Therefore, they obtain it from ammonia. Again, carbonic acid gas is but one in two thousand five hundred parts of the air; yet it, too, is essential to plants. In itself it is a poison to animals, and yet an essential for plants, without which animals cannot live. If our atmosphere contained even so little as one part in a hundred of carbonic acid gas, it would suffocate us.

We see, then, that so delicately adjusted are the constituents of our atmosphere that any considerable variation would make life impossible.

The alternation of night and day, as we have it, may also be vital, and that not merely in order that night may be a time of rest both for plants and animals, though that is a point by no means to be overlooked. Miss A. M. Clerke writes: "We are indebted to our satellite for the alternations of day and night, *which make life possible.*"¹⁰ But the chief purpose of this alternation is this, that the

¹⁰ The Concise Knowledge Library, "Astronomy," Sec. III., "The Solar System," c. V., p. 283.

earth may not have time enough to become either too hot or too cold. If day and night were each considerably longer, the heat accumulated by day and the cold manifested by night would afford such rapid and violent contrasts that, again, the higher vegetation and animal life would be impossible.

Those evolutionists, however, who, at all price, will have it that other worlds are inhabited by man, shrink not from the contention that man *might* exist under conditions totally different from those which obtain on earth. Such an argument we need not controvert. Of course, water *might* run up hill. Plants *might* live without carbonic acid. Animals *might* be found on the airless and waterless moon. Man *might* live at the bottom of the Pacific, But is it much use to discuss such possibilities?

IV.

That the above (among other) complex conditions essential to life are verified on earth is, of course, evident, since they are not abstract and speculative, but entirely practical. They are formulated from what we know of our surroundings. With good reason, therefore, may we wonder at the nice balance and delicate adjustment of so many disconnected and conflicting elements, and ask ourselves by what agency it was that they were all thus ordered "in measure, and number, and weight."¹¹

Take, as an instance, the earth's distance from the sun. The heat of the sun varies, like gravity, inversely as the square of the distance. At double the distance it would be but one-fourth of its present value. At half the distance it would be four times what it is now. Even at two-thirds the distance it would be twice as much as we experience. Hence, considering the sensitiveness of protoplasm, the "physical basis of life," and of the ease with which albumen coagulates, it is evident that our earth is in the temperate zone of the Solar System. On another planet, notably either nearer to or more remote from the sun, the higher life of flora and fauna would be impossible.

Take another instance. We have pointed out that to fulfill the conditions of life the atmosphere must have a certain density and be composed of a definite admixture of definite gases. What is the factor which determines these two essential conditions? It is partly the mass of the globe in question, for all the different gases are in a state of rapid motion. Their movement may be so quick that the force of gravity on the globe cannot hold back the particles of gas. The centrifugal force of their motion outwards may exceed the

¹¹ Wisdom xl., 20.

centripetal force of attraction inwards. With us that is the case with hydrogen gas. This gas moves so nimbly that it escapes into space as rapidly as it is generated by submarine volcanoes, by fissures in volcanic regions, by decaying vegetation and by other methods. Were, however, the mass of the earth much greater, it would have power to retain the hydrogen. With what result? A fatal result. For this hydrogen would mix with the free oxygen of the atmosphere, and thus form so highly explosive a compound that the first flash of lightning would ignite it with a crash so tremendous that earth would become an impossible home for man.

We may, therefore, conclude that the mass of the earth touches the maximum limit fitted for the habitation of man.

We may also note, in passing, the enormous quantity of hydrogen (combined with oxygen) which goes to form our rivers, lakes, seas and oceans. Why did free hydrogen formerly remain on earth to form water when it will not remain now? No one knows. And why did it remain in such exact quantity that the water formed from it fills our ocean beds and yet does not overflow the land? Or, to put the problem in another way, the ocean area of the earth is about two and a half times that of the land. But the bulk of water on the globe is some fifteen times that of land above sea-level. Had our earth been a true oblate spheroid (orange-shaped), the whole would have been covered with water to a depth of two miles! What agency, then, was it that scooped out the ocean beds deep enough to accommodate thus exactly the stupendous amount of hydrogen (combined in water) which remained on earth then? Had there been less hydrogen, in combination with oxygen as water, there would not have been enough water. Had there been one-tenth more hydrogen, the whole land surface would have been submerged. Who produced this exact adjustment? Shall we say that we do not know? But there, at any rate, it is, staring us in the face.

V.

Have these conditions essential to life been verified anywhere else than on earth?

First, as to the sun. Sir Isaac Newton himself argued that the sun was probably inhabited. Fortenelle even wrote a book, "*Conversations on the Plurality of Worlds*," to uphold the same opinion. But we might with much more reason argue that the three Jews—Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego—walked unhurt, without miracle, in that fiery furnace which Nebuchadnezzar in his wrath had commanded to be heated seven-fold more than it was wont,¹² for the

¹² Daniel, c. III.

furnace of the Babylonian king was cool compared with the white-hot metal in a Bessemer converter. Yet Professor Langley has proved experimentally that the sun is eighty-seven times hotter than Bessemer's molten steel.

Next, as to the moon. As her mass is only about one-eightieth that of the earth, the force of gravity on the moon is too weak to retain even so heavy a gas as carbonic acid; with the result that our satellite does not possess a particle of free oxygen, nitrogen or aqueous vapour. Sir R. Ball writes:¹³ "Neither the times nor the seasons, neither the gravitation nor the other destructive features of the moon would permit it to be an endurable abode for life of the types we are acquainted with."

Thirdly, as to the planets of the solar system. These are called *inferior* and *superior*, according as they are *within* or *without* the earth's orbit. In the order of proximity to the sun, the inferior are Mercury and Venus; the superior, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune.

First, then, the inferior planets are not inhabited.

Not Mercury. Its mass is but one-thirtieth that of the earth. Hence, oxygen, nitrogen and aqueous vapour would necessarily escape from it. Moreover, the relative distances from the sun of Mercury and earth are as four to ten, so that Mercury is but two-fifths of the earth's distance from the sun.¹⁴ Mercury, therefore, receives over six times as much solar heat as does the earth. It is, therefore, intensely hot. Nor is that all. Mercury keeps always one and the same face towards the sun, so that one side of the planet is hard-baked, the other side is hard-frozen. Consequently, even if there once had been oceans on Mercury—of which there is no proof—they must long ago have been boiled off the hot side and condensed into mountains of ice on the cold side. Therefore, A. M. Clerke¹⁵ writes: "Mercury is, according to our ideas, totally unfitted to be the abode of organic life."

Nor Venus. The relative distances from the sun of Venus and earth are as seven to ten. Venus, therefore, is only seven-tenths the earth's distance from the sun, so that she receives about twice as much solar heat as the earth. She, too, must therefore be very hot. The thermometer in London in August, 1896, registered 93 degrees in the shade. But what would 186 degrees in the shade be like? Again, Venus, like Mercury, rotates on her axis during the same time that she revolves round the sun, and therefore she, too, presents always the

¹³ "High Heavens," p. 48.

¹⁴ The mean distance, from the Sun, of Mercury is 36,000,000, of the Earth 92,750,000 miles.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, c. IV., p. 277.

same face to the sun. Consequently, one-half of the planet has perpetual day; the other half has perpetual night, with the result that the cold side must be deeply wrapped in perpetual ice, while the hot side must rise to a temperature far too high for animal life. Miss Clerke sums up in these words: "With due reserve it may be added that Venus and Mercury have been rendered unfit to be the abodes of highly-developed organisms."¹⁶

Secondly, the superior planets are not inhabited.

Not Mars. The case of this planet we reserve for more detailed discussion later.

Not Jupiter. This mighty planet is not a solid body at all, but either a gaseous or, at any rate, a molten mass. A. M. Clerke writes: "Jupiter is a semi-sun, showing no trace of a solid surface. . . . It is a fluid globe."¹⁷ Hence it is uninhabitable. "I see no likelihood," wrote Sir Robert Ball,¹⁸ "that Jupiter can be the home of any life whatever."

Not Saturn, Uranus or Neptune. Of these outermost planets it is unnecessary to speak in detail. Richard A. Proctor, who stoutly upheld the antecedent probability that the planets are inhabited, and wrote two learned works to maintain his view—"Other Worlds Than Ours" and "Our Place Among Infinities"—comes to the conclusion that the three planets in question are unfit for habitation, and he bases his inference on plain astronomical and physical facts.

Like Jupiter, Saturn is not even a solid. A. M. Clerke¹⁹ says: "There is no probability that either Saturn or Jupiter is, to any extent, solid." And, as is evident, man cannot flourish on a molten globe.

To Uranus the same objection applies. For this planet is still so hot that water could not exist on its surface; nay, that aqueous vapour would be decomposed into its constituent gases, oxygen and hydrogen. Miss Clerke²⁰ writes: "Uranus is presumably, almost certainly, still too hot to permit the combination of hydrogen and oxygen. And the absence from its spectrum of the slightest trace of aqueous absorption strengthens this inference." Life is certainly impossible under so tremendous a temperature.

Neptune is in like condition. It is so hot that water on its surface would be broken up into its component gases. Miss Clerke²¹ writes: "It may be inferred that this planet also is too hot to contain water."

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 346.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

Yet, in spite of this excessive heat from its own interior, Neptune receives so little sunlight and sun-heat that these essential requisites of high organic life are also wanting. For Neptune lies thirty-eight times further off from the sun than does the earth, so that it receives from the sun fourteen hundred times less heat and light than the earth. As Sir R. remarks:²² "This fact alone would seem to show an insuperable obstacle to the existence of any life on Neptune resembling those types of life with which we are familiar."

It has indeed been argued that these outer planets are cooling down to habitability. The reply is obvious that habitability requires many other vital conditions besides this cooling down. Moreover, such cooling down may take many millions of years. Now, on the materialistic hypothesis, the evolution of life from the lowest forms up to man would take many more millions of years. But the sun is also cooling down, and will one day be as cold as the moon. Lord Kelvin gives the sun only about five or six million years more. He writes: "It would be exceedingly rash . . . to reckon more than five or six million years of sunlight for time to come."²³ Life, under those conditions, with a moon-like sun, would be impossible, for, as Wallace observes,²⁴ "Jupiter, and the planets beyond him, whose epoch of life-development is supposed to be in the remote future, when they shall have slowly cooled down to habitability, will then be still more faintly illuminated and scantily warmed by a rapidly-cooling Sun, and may thus become, at the best, globes of solid ice."

The case of Mars we have yet to consider. But so far these two points seem to be clear:

First, that even if the essential conditions of life obtained on any other planet, besides the earth, it could not be shown that life had been introduced into that planet, for the assertion that life can be, and would be, evolved by natural processes from non-life is a mere fable.

Secondly, that—Mars for the present apart—no other planet, besides the earth, possesses those complicated and accurately-balanced conditions which are absolutely essential to life.

No other planet is habitable. And even if it were, that would not prove it to be inhabited.

Every other planet is uninhabitable. Therefore, it is uninhabited.

Man, on this earth, is consequently the crown and climax of the universe.

²² *Ibid*, p. 48.

²³ Lecture at Royal Institution, published in *Nature Series*, 1889.

²⁴ *Ibid*, c. XIV., p. 280.

VI.

Sir Robert Ball²⁵ tells us that "Mars is the most world-like of all the other globes which come within the range of effective observation."

We have already seen that proof is conspicuous by its absence of the habitability of the other planets—except Mars—of the solar system. The habitability of the stars we need not discuss, for they are beyond "the range of effective observation." And if we cannot prove even for our planets that consummation devoutly to be wished by so many materialists, it is waste of time to try and prove it for the stars.

If man lives a natural life anywhere outside this Earth of ours, every probability points to Mars as that place of abode.

Does man, then, live on Mars?

Let Dr. Ball make answer: "The laws of probability pronounce against the supposition that there is intelligent life on Mars."²⁶

We now take up the discussion of this question.

In an astronomical work that was at one time much read²⁷ the point in question is assumed as indisputable. Having drawn out the analogies between the earth and Mars, the writer says: "Were we warranted, from such circumstances, to form an opinion respecting the physical and moral state of the beings that inhabit Mars, we might be apt to conclude that they are in a condition not altogether very different from that of the inhabitants of our globe."

The actual existence of such beings he takes to be a matter of course; it is only their "condition" that he has any doubts about. Nay, he actually gives a census of the Martian population, and it is instructive to learn from Mr. Dick that it amounts to "twelve times the number of the population of our globe!"

That able astronomer, Richard A. Proctor,²⁸ finds in Mars so many resemblance to, and so many analogies with, our earth that he, too, holds that planet to be, almost for certain, inhabited.

Flammarion, however, the Parisian astronomer, calls in question Proctor's premises, and concludes to the contrary that "the general order of things is very different on Mars and on the Earth."²⁹ Flammarion denies, indeed, that man's abode is Earth alone, and in dramatic fashion observes: "Yes, life is universal and eternal, for time is one of its factors. Yesterday the moon, to-day the earth, to-morrow Jupiter. In space there are both cradles and tombs." And if we want proof of this fine language, M. Flammarion is ready

²⁵ "In the High Heavens," c. VI., pp. 123-124.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

²⁷ Dick's "Celestial Scenery," 12th thousand, c. III., n. 4; "Mars," p. 122.

²⁸ "Other Worlds Than Ours" and "Our Place Among Infinities."

²⁹ *Scientific American*, February 29, 1896.

with a copious supply. Here it is: "Infinity encompasses us on all sides; life asserts itself, universal and eternal; our existence is but a fleeting moment, the vibration of an atom in a ray of the sun, and our planet is but an island floating in the celestial archipelago to which no thought will ever place any bounds." And should we suggest to the French savant that all this rhetoric is but "words, words, words," he would plaintively tell us that "in our solar system this little earth has not obtained any special privileges from Nature, and it is strange to wish to confine life within the circle of terrestrial chemistry."⁸⁰

We have really no wish to "confine life within the circle of terrestrial chemistry," if either M. Camille Flammarion or any one else will furnish aught besides eloquence in proof that life exists outside. But it is for him to prove that life exists outside that circle, not for us to prove that it exists only within. We are, however, absolutely certain that we have already furnished ample evidence of the fact that "this little earth *has* obtained" a good many "special privileges from Nature."

Proctor argued that Mars was habitable, and that it must therefore be inhabited. Man might be there; therefore, he must be there. But the writer did not prove his premises.

This is the form of Proctor's argument:

"What is habitable must be inhabited.

"But Mars is habitable.

"Therefore, Mars is inhabited."

Now of this argument he demonstrated neither the major nor the minor premise.

First of all, his major premise, that the habitable *must* be inhabited, he did not prove. His inference is invalid from *might* to *must*. The scholastic axiom is obvious that *a posse ad esse non valet illatio*; you cannot conclude from possibility to actuality. A thing must be possible before it can exist, but it need not exist because it is possible. Proctor based his major premise on vague theological grounds, which, whatever else they might be, were certainly not scientific. Science, as we are being continually and proudly assured, argues only from "observation and experiment." But neither observation nor experiment affords any clue to the presence of man on Mars. Nay, even if (by hypothesis) the planet were inhabited, nevertheless the Martian man could not be perceived either by observation or experiment, for, under the most favorable conditions, Mars is distant from the earth never less than thirty-five million miles. At this time its apparent diameter is that of half a sovereign viewed at two thousand yards from the spectator!

⁸⁰ *Knowledge*, June, 1903.

We have all, indeed, heard of the possibility of signals between Mars and the earth! But if the whole planet, forty-two hundred miles wide, looks only as big as half a sovereign over a mile off, what size would a man look? Over a million times smaller than the gold piece in question. The signaling flags, to be visible at all, would have to be larger than Ireland. And Brobdingnagians, indeed, would the signal men have to be who should lightly wield flags of those dimensions!

Nor could we solve the problem by viewing Mars through the gigantic Lick telescope, which reduces the apparent distance of an object to about one-thousandth part of its actual amount. It would lessen the distance of Mars from thirty-five millions to thirty-five thousand miles. But that is a dozen times as far away as is Europe from America. You can hardly see a man half a mile away. A score of miles away—say, in a balloon—he would be quite imperceptible. The smallest visible speck on Mars, viewed through the Lick thirty-six-inch instrument, would have to be as big as London. A Martian Liverpool and Manchester, united into one city, would not look as large as a pin-point.

It may be objected against us that if a house is habitable, it was at least meant for habitation; and therefore if Mars is habitable, it was at least meant for habitation. We reply, however, that that is a false analogy. For we know that the sole purpose of a habitable house is that it should be used for habitation. But we cannot prove that the sole purpose of Mars, even if habitable, is that it should be inhabited. A house is habitable *per se*; Mars might be habitable *per accidens*. The conditions which make for habitability might also make for some other purpose of an entirely different kind—a purpose of which we are quite ignorant.

Therefore, to the question: "If Mars be habitable, is it inhabited?" we can give no answer. It might be, or it might not. We know absolutely nothing about it.

Against this last statement, however, it may be urged that we know, by inference, of the presence of man on Mars. For Mars is intersected by a network of *artificial* canals, dug by Martian men for the purpose of irrigating the Martian Saharas! A well-known astronomer, Mr. Percival Lowell, has no doubt of this fact. He tells us that, undoubtedly, certain districts of Mars are "artificially fertilized by the canal system. . . . Here, then, we have an end and reason for the existence of canals, and the most natural conceivable—namely, that the canals are constructed for the express purpose of fertilizing the oases."³¹

Mr. Dick has informed us of the number of Mars' population.

³¹ "Popular Astronomy," Vol. I, 1895, p. 348.

Mr. Lowell now informs us of the engineering works with which this population has improved the planet it inhabits!

Professor Tyndall, it would appear, was not the only one who indulged in the use of the "Imagination in Science!"

Sir Robert Ball, a not incompetent authority, does not share in Mr. Lowell's confidence. He writes:³² "Speculations have naturally been made as to the explanation of these wonderful canals. It has been suggested that they are rivers. But it hardly seems likely that the drainage of continents on so small a globe as Mars would require an elaborate system of rivers, each sixty miles wide and thousands of miles in length. There is, however, a more fatal objection to the river theory in the fact that the marks we are trying to interpret sometimes cross a Martian continent from ocean to ocean, while on other occasions they seem to intersect each other. Such phenomena are, of course, well-nigh impossible, if these so-called canals were in any respect analogous to the rivers which we know on our own globe."

Nor are these the only difficulties against the theory of "artificial irrigation." For instance, some of these single canals on Mars are suddenly—within twenty-four hours, and that simultaneously along their whole course of thousands of miles—transformed into double canals, which "run straight and equal with the exact geometrical precision of the two rails of a railroad."³³

If this second canal is also "artificial" and is "artificially" thus flooded, the Martians are something like engineers!

Professor Campbell,³⁴ however, seems to have given the "artificial irrigation" theory its deathblow. For he has proved that the "canal" districts of Mars, instead of being a flat expanse, are intersected by mountains 10,000 feet high. Now, even Martian engineers would hardly manage, we should imagine, to run canals over the tops of Martian Mont Blancs!

Mr. Lowell had confidently written³⁵ that "when we consider the amazing system of the canal lines we are carried to this conclusion (of the irrigation theory) as forthright as is the water itself." In view, however, of the fact that these imaginary engineering works are sixty miles wide, are thousands of miles long, are double, run straight and equal like curveless railway lines, and traverse mountainous regions, we may safely agree with Miss A. M. Clerke's more cautious conclusion that "these systems of canals offer at present no

³² *Ibid.*, c. VI., p. 144.

³³ Schiaparelli, of the Milan observatory, *Astronomy and Astro-Physics*, November, 1894, p. 720.

³⁴ "Publ. A. S. P.," Vol. VI., p. 273.

³⁵ *L. c.*

hold for profitable speculation."³⁶ Schiaparelli³⁷ agrees with Miss Clerke and is compelled to trust to "the courtesy of nature" for some future ray of light wherewith to penetrate the mystery. And, not unwisely, he deprecates recourse to human beings with their engineering exploits. Indeed, he thinks that such arbitrary modes of dealing with grave problems hinder the advance of science and impede the acquisition of truth. Science should make theories square with facts, not facts with theories. In science the wish should not be father to the thought.

Having disposed of this "canal" objection, we may now resume our argument. We turn, therefore, to Proctor's minor premise that Mars is habitable. We reply that Mars has not been proved habitable. On the contrary, all the data are against habitability.

If Mars were habitable, it would possess water and water-vapor. For these two are among the essential requisites of life. Does Mars possess them? Whether it holds water-vapour or not depends—as explained already—on the planet's mass and on its consequent ability to retain the vapour. Now, the mass of Mars is only one-ninth that of the earth, and therefore the probability is that its force of gravity—not more than two-fifths that of the earth—is insufficient to retain water-vapour. Dr. Alfred Wallace says unhesitatingly: "Mars has not sufficient mass to retain water-vapour, and without it cannot be habitable."³⁸ Professor Ball, however, thinks that the mass of Mars is enough to retain this vapour, but that Mars is the minimum mass that can do so. If this latter opinion be correct, the earth's mass is the maximum, Mars' the minimum, of habitability.³⁹ Ball confesses, however, that "clouds are comparatively an unimportant feature on Mars."⁴⁰ No one, indeed, denies that there are clouds, very thin clouds, on Mars, but it has to be shown that they are formed of water. And even if they are, they are not rain-clouds, but must be those whitish masses of suspended crystals which we call cirrus-clouds, such as are formed in our own atmosphere by the condensation at heights of from 17,000 to 20,000 feet of vapor into the solid form. Hence Miss Clerke writes⁴¹ that "in the atmosphere of Mars it would be rarely possible to find collections of cloud capable of producing rain of any consequence."

If Mars possesses water-vapour, does the planet also contain water from which the vapour is evaporated? Dr. Wallace⁴² thinks it does

³⁶ *Ibid.*, c. VI., p. 305.

³⁷ *L. c.*

³⁸ "Man's Place in the Universe," c. XIV., p. 266.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, c. II., p. 133.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 308.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 267.

not. "It is almost certain that it contains no water." And to the plausible objection that Mars shows polar snows, which melt in the Martian summer, and thus produce water, Wallace replies that these snows are "caused by carbonic acid or by some other heavy gas."⁴³ Even Ball is far from asserting that the snows at the poles of Mars are snows in our sense of the word. He says:⁴⁴ "These polar snows must be some white material . . . possibly of some liquid other than water."

Therefore, whether or not there be on Mars either water-vapour or water is, at least, uncertain. It is not proven. But if there be any water, it must be very little. A. M. Clerke⁴⁵ tells us that "the proportion of water to land is much smaller on Mars than on the earth. Only two-sevenths of the disc are covered by the dusky areas, and of late the aqueous nature of some, if not of all of these, has been seriously called in question." Professor Pickering⁴⁶ showed that "the permanent water area upon Mars, *if it exist at all*, is extremely limited in its dimensions." And he estimates this hypothetical water area at half the size of the Mediterranean! Professor Schaeberle⁴⁷ does not believe that the so-called seas are seas at all. And Professor Barnard, with the great Lick telescope, discovered that these seas resembled, and probably were, a mountainous country broken by cañon, rift and ledge!

The *onus probandi* lies on those who affirm the habitability of Mars; yet so far, in their attempts to prove the presence of water and water-vapour, they have made many bold assertions, but have adduced uncommonly little evidence.

Next, as to the temperature of Mars. We have considered already the delicate combination of nicely balanced conditions necessary for the production of a climate fitted for human life. What proof positive is there that such conditions obtain on Mars?

A definite amount of sunshine is necessary to sustain the life of man. He can live permanently neither in an ice house nor in a furnace. Yet Mars must be something like an ice house. For the planet receives, per unit of surface, considerably less than half the sunshine which warms the earth. Again, the Martian atmosphere must necessarily be very thin. It has been calculated that the density of this atmosphere on the surface of the planet can be only about one-seventh that of the earth at sea-level. In other words, the air on the surface of Mars is twice as thin as on the peaks of the Himalayas! That fact alone seems fatal to life. For in an air of such tenuity it would be hard for man to breathe; he could only gasp. Again, an atmosphere with such a lack of density would

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

make it impossible for the planet to retain during the night the comparatively small amount of heat which it had absorbed during the daytime. Sir R. Ball⁴⁸ writes: "It is the atmosphere which to a large extent mitigates the fierceness with which the Sun's rays would beat down on the globe, if it were devoid of such protection. Again, at night the atmospheric covering serves to screen us from the cold that would otherwise be the consequence of unrestricted radiation from the earth into space. It is, therefore, obvious that the absence of a copious atmosphere, though perhaps not so absolutely incompatible with life of some kind, must still necessitate types of life of a wholly different character from those with which we are familiar." Mars, being devoid of a "copious atmosphere," cannot, then, be the abode of man at any rate.

Mars must be intensely cold; so cold, indeed, that "the theoretical mean temperature is 61 degrees Fahrenheit below the freezing-point."⁴⁹

Schiaparelli⁵⁰ writes: "The climate of Mars must resemble that of a clear day upon a high mountain. By day, a very strong solar radiation, hardly at all mitigated by mist or vapour; by night, a copious radiation from the soil towards celestial space, and hence a very marked radiation, consequently a climate of extremes and great changes of temperature from day to night and from one season to another . . . would be notably increased by their long duration."⁵¹

Alfred Wallace⁵² holds that "during the greater part of the twenty-four hours the surface temperature of Mars would probably be much below the freezing-point of water; and this, taken in conjunction with the total absence of aqueous vapour or liquid water, would add still further to its unsuitability for animal life."

Furthermore, what are the constituents of the atmosphere of Mars? For, as we saw formerly, it is absolutely essential to life not only that the air which plants and animals breathe should be composed of certain constituent gases, but also that these gases should be mixed in a certain definite proportion. Is the air of Mars thus constituted of the right gases and mixed in the right proportion? There is not the slightest proof forthcoming that it is.

First of all, without oxygen and nitrogen in given proportions

⁴⁶ *Astronomy and Astro-Physics*, August, 1894, p. 554.

⁴⁷ "Publ. Astro. Soc. of the Pacific," Vol. II., p. 196.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁴⁹ Clerke, *Ibid.*, p. 308.

⁵⁰ *Astronomy and Astro-Physics*, October, 1894, p. 640.

⁵¹ The Martian day is twenty-four hours, thirty-seven minutes. The Martian year is 687 days—nearly twice as long as that of the Earth—with the result that the Martian seasons are nearly twice as long as ours.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 268.

organic life cannot exist. Does the Martian atmosphere contain oxygen and nitrogen thus properly mixed? There is no evidence that it does. There is no real evidence that this essential composition of gases is there at all, nor are we sure that, even if it were there, the small density of Mars due to its small mass would enable the planet to retain it. Sir R. Ball⁵³ writes that "as to what the composition of the atmosphere on Mars may be, we can say but little," and he quite recognizes the fact that "there may now be no free oxygen in its atmosphere."

To sum up. Not only, then, have we no jot of proof that Mars is inhabited by man, we have not even any tittle of evidence that the planet is habitable by man. Nay, facts point strongly in the other direction. Even so very sanguine a writer on this subject as Dr. Ball is compelled to admit that "it is not in the least likely that any man, woman or child transplanted from this Earth to Mars could live and thrive there. The temperature might be endurable, and water appears to be not wanting, but I do not think we have any reason to expect that the atmosphere would suit human beings, either in quantity or in quality."⁵⁴

Here we conclude. The materialistic evolutionist argues against Christianity that man is not restricted to the Earth among the spheres any more than he is restricted to Europe upon the Earth; and, therefore, to affirm that God died only for terrestrial man is as absurd as to affirm that He died only for European man. To this objection we have supplied, as it seems to us, a crushing answer. For, according to the highest scientists, the Earth alone is inhabited and is inhabitable by man. Not only is there no proof that an extra terrestrial man exists; there is no proof that there is any place where he could exist. That other planets are inhabited, or even inhabitable, is a wild assertion for which no shadow of real evidence has up to this been produced.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

Bournemouth, England.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, c. II., p. 51.

A HARMONY OF THE RESURRECTION.

THERE is much more in the Gospel than it explicitly contains, even regarding it simply as history. A striking characteristic of the Evangelists is their reserve. Not only did St. Luke address his Gospel to one already instructed (St. Luke i., 3-4), but it is evident that the other Evangelists also wrote primarily for those who were familiar with unrecorded facts which threw light on the Gospel narratives.

Our ignorance of many things known to the first readers of the Gospel obliges us to resort to conjecture; and often when we would like to be certain we must say "perhaps."

But while we must remain in uncertainty as to some points of Gospel history, at the same time there is no difficulty in the way of a harmony of the Evangelists for which a reasonable explanation cannot be found. And many hidden truths of Gospel history are revealed through a careful comparison of the Evangelists.

Writing of events which took place in their own time, events in which they took an absorbing interest, the presumption is that the Evangelists knew the exact truth and recorded nothing contrary to it. A contradiction even regarding a detail would not be a matter of slight importance. The judgment of Daniel condemning the elders rested on the detail of the difference between two trees.

That the Evangelists in writing of the Resurrection do not undertake to give a full and complete account of the apparitions of Christ is sufficiently shown by the fact that they do not give any account of the special apparition to Simon-Peter (I. Cor. xv., 15); it is only referred to (St. Luke xxiv., 34), and the special apparition to James, of which the Evangelists must have known, since it was known to the Apostle of the Gentiles (I. Cor. xv., 7), is not even mentioned in the Gospel. Neither is there recorded any apparition to the Mother of Christ.

There is no part of the Gospel so difficult to harmonize as the part dealing with the Resurrection. To show that the seemingly contradictory Evangelistic accounts of the day on which Christ rose again from the dead are not in reality contradictory, is to refute one of the strongest charges against the historical accuracy of the Gospel.

The difficulties which have seemed to make it impossible to give a harmonious account of the recorded events of the Resurrection day are chiefly in regard to the women to whom the angelic announcement was made.

It seems to be implied by the Synoptic Evangelists (in a different way by each of the three) that Mary Magdalene heard the angelic

announcement at her first coming to the sepulchre; but it is certain from the Fourth Gospel that she did not (St. John xx., 2).

It would seem from St. Luke that Mary the mother of James was one of the women to whom the Resurrection was announced at early dawn (St. Luke xxiv., 1-10); yet according to St. Mark, Mary the mother of James was one of the women who, when the sun had risen, were coming to the sepulchre, questioning who would roll away the stone for them (St. Mark xvi., 1-3). The chief difficulty, however, is this: According to the Fourth Gospel, when Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene on the morning of the Resurrection she was weeping for Him, not knowing that He had risen (St. John xx., 15), yet it is certain from St. Matthew that she was one of the women who heard the angelic announcement (St. Matt. xxviii., 1-6). The Evangelists here seem to conflict irreconcilably. But it may be that even after she had seen the risen Lord she did not understand the truth of the Resurrection. She may not have understood it until she was convinced by the angelic announcement that Christ had appeared to her in the same body that had been placed in the tomb.

It would not be strange if Mary Magdalene did not realize the truth of the Resurrection immediately upon seeing the risen Lord. She was by no means credulous as she is sometimes represented to have been. When she found the sepulchre empty she did not even hope that Christ had risen, but ran to Peter and John and said to them: "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him." (St. John xx., 2.)

So when Christ, after He had spoken to her, suddenly disappeared, she would naturally think that she had seen a spirit, as the Apostles thought that they saw a spirit when He appeared in the midst of them, until He assured them of the reality of His risen body, saying to them: "Handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see Me to have." (St. Luke xxiv., 37-39.)

The Fourth Evangelist says nothing of the incredulity of Mary Magdalene as to the reality of Christ's risen body, but neither does that Evangelist mention the incredulity of the Apostles when he tells of the apparition to them (St. John xx., 19-24). It is St. Luke who mentions that the Apostles thought that they saw a spirit, and it is St. Matthew who, in making known that Mary Magdalene heard the angelic announcement, gives ground for the supposition that she, also, thought that Christ was a spirit.¹

Turning to St. Matthew we find that he prefaces the angelic announcement by saying: "The angel answering said to the women" (St. Matt. xxviii., 5), and though Salome was present, as we see from

¹ Up to the time that she recognized the Lord, she was reiterating her belief that His body had been taken away (St. John xx., 13-15).

St. Mark, the only women St. Matthew mentions in his account of the Resurrection are Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James; so that we must conclude that Mary Magdalene was one of the women addressed by the angel.

It is impossible to suppose that after hearing the angelic announcement she stood at the sepulchre weeping; for doubting the word of an angel Zacharias was stricken dumb (St. Luke i., 19-22). Moreover, the women, of whom Mary Magdalene was one, when they came out from the sepulchre went quickly, as they had been told by the angel to go—they ran (St. Matt. xxviii., 7-8).

But like Peter and the two disciples of Emmaus, Mary Magdalene saw the Lord twice on the first Easter day. Having disappeared from her at the sepulchre that she, as well as the other women, might hear the announcement of the Resurrection from the appointed messengers, He appeared to her and her companions as they were returning with great joy (St. Matt. xxviii., 8-9). And it may thus be that the message in regard to the Ascension which the Fourth Evangelist records (St. John xx., 17), was not given to her until after she heard the angelic announcement.

It being in accordance with the spiritual body (I. Cor. xv., 44) with which Christ had risen to suddenly appear and disappear, there is only the question as to when the disappearance from Mary Magdalene took place. We seem justified by St. Matthew's Gospel in supposing that it was before she received a message to take to the Apostles; in other words, that when she recognized the Lord He disappeared, as He vanished from the sight of the two disciples at Emmaus when they knew Him in the breaking of bread (St. Luke xxiv., 31).

It is no more remarkable that St. John omits to mention the angelic announcement and the second apparition to Mary Magdalene than that the same Evangelist in his history of Passion omits to mention the sending of Christ to Herod and the return to Pilate.

Important events always give the impression of occupying much time; but even though the angelic announcement intervened, the two apparitions to Mary Magdalene may have been only a few minutes apart. It may have been very near the sepulchre that Christ met the women as they were running. The two apparitions are so closely connected as to be almost one.

In reading the Fourth Gospel we receive a strong impression that the words which followed Mary Magdalene's recognition of the Lord followed immediately; it seems at first like doing violence to the text to suppose otherwise. But not when we consider the method of the Evangelists—that they omit much which an ordinary writer would be certain to record. The Fourth Evangelist expressly

states that he left unrecorded many signs which Jesus did (St. John xx., 30). St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles specifies that between the Resurrection and the Ascension forty days intervened, during which Christ showed Himself to the Apostles by many proofs (Acts i., 3); and yet St. Luke in his Gospel, "the former treatise," having told of only the first apparition to the Apostles, proceeds to record the Ascension as though no other apparitions had intervened (St. Luke xxiv., 36-53).

Such being the method of the Evangelists, it does not seem much to suppose that the words which to judge from the Fourth Gospel alone, followed immediately upon Mary Magdalene's recognition of the Lord, were not spoken until a few minutes later.

Thus even though, according to the Fourth Evangelist, Mary Magdalene saw the Lord as she was at the sepulchre weeping, not knowing that He had risen, while according to St. Matthew she was one of the women who heard the angelic announcement, it cannot be said that the Evangelists therefore contradict one another, for it must be admitted that it is at least possible that she heard the announcement after she saw the risen Lord, but before she fully realized the truth of the Resurrection.

It is at least possible; and the fact that it seems to be the *only* possible explanation of the difficulty makes it more than possible to a believer in the historical accuracy of the Gospel.

We might infer from St. Matthew's Gospel that Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James arrived at the sepulchre at the very beginning of the dawn when the angel rolled away the stone, and that they immediately heard from that angel the announcement of the Resurrection (St. Matt. xxviii., 1-5). But the Greek in the first verse of the last chapter of St. Matthew allows of the interpretation that at the beginning of the dawn, when the angel rolled away the stone, the two women had only set out for the sepulchre.

As the Greek verb (*elthen*) in St. Matthew xxviii., 1, which is translated "came," may be translated "went;" instead of reading "Came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre," we may read, "Went Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." The substitution of *went* for *came* not only reconciles St. Matthew with St. John, but also St. Mark, who makes known that when the Resurrection was announced to these women the sun had risen (St. Mark xvi., 1-6). From the Vulgate we may read: "Cometh Mary Magdalene and the other Mary." And although the primary meaning of the verb "*venit*" does not grammatically agree with the Greek verb, which requires either "went" or "came," yet essentially the same meaning is conveyed, for as soon as the women have set out it can be said that they are coming.

The question of the time of their arrival is thus left open so far as St. Matthew's Gospel is concerned. While Mary of James perhaps stopped on the way for Salome, Mary Magdalene, hastening on to the sepulchre, arrived for the first time when it was still that part of the dawn which more resembles night than day (St. John xx., 1). Before Mary of James arrived with Salome, when the sun had risen, Mary Magdalene may have had time to come for her second visit to the sepulchre. We do not know where Peter and John were when she saw them, but we do know that she *ran* to them, and that they *ran* to the sepulchre (St. John xx., 2-4). Having seen for themselves that Christ was not there, they departed. But Mary stood there weeping (St. John xx., 10-11).

When Christ appeared to her she may not have looked closely at Him, which would account for her supposing Him to be the gardener, the sepulchre being in a garden. The Greek verb "*theorei*" in St. John xx., 14, does not indicate an attentive gaze, but simply that she observed Him. When it is said, for instance, that the maid at the fireplace looked intently at Peter (St. Luke xxii., 56), another verb (*atenisasa*) is used, which indicates that manner of looking.

As Mary Magdalene straightened up from the stooping posture which she had to assume in order to see into the sepulchre, she became aware that some one was standing near her; but, without looking attentively to see who it was, she may have turned aside to hide her tears. And it seems that, her mind being preoccupied, she did not hear Christ's first recorded words: "Woman, why weep-est thou?" for she did not answer His question. And when He spoke again, calling her by name, she was not yet looking towards Him, for she turned to say to Him: "Rabboni" (St. John xx., 11-16).

It does not follow from St. Mark's Gospel that the women who bought spices when the Sabbath was past all came to the sepulchre together. As St. Mark in his account of the Resurrection mentions two women besides Mary Magdalene, when he speaks of the women in general Mary Magdalene may, for sufficient reason, be excepted.

So then, the sun having risen, Mary the mother of James and Salome came to the sepulchre, asking one another who would roll away the stone for them (St. Mark xvi., 2-3). And the angel who at the beginning of the dawn had rolled it away, appearing at the entrance of the sepulchre, made known to them and to Mary Magdalene that Christ had truly risen (St. Matt. xxviii., 2-7).

If she thought that Christ had appeared to her as a spirit she would naturally be troubled and affrighted, as the Apostles were under a similar misapprehension; so that the admonition to the women not to fear would apply to her in a special manner. And the words of the angel, "He is not here, for He is risen" (St. Matt.

xxviii., 6), would give her the assurance that Christ had appeared to her in the same body that had been placed in the sepulchre. Until she received that assurance she would not give up her search for the crucified body of Christ (St. Matt. xxviii., 5).

The words of the angel, "Come and see the place where the Lord lay," would seem to have been addressed exclusively to the women who had come to the sepulchre for the first time, but those words may have been meant also for Mary Magdalene, even though she had seen that Christ was not there. She was to look upon the sepulchre with different eyes. Having regarded it as the desecrated place of Christ's burial, at the invitation of the angel she was to look upon it as the glorious place from which He had risen. And having gone of her own accord to tell the disciples that the body of the Lord had been taken away, now she was to go to them with messages from heaven that He had risen (St. Matt. xxviii., 7), and would go before them into Galilee (St. Mark xvi., 7).

According to the Fourth Gospel Mary Magdalene, just before she saw the Lord, had seen two angels seated in the sepulchre who asked her why she wept (St. John xx., 11-13). And it is evident from a comparison of the Gospels that both angels proclaimed the Resurrection to her and her companions. The women were without when the first angel, appearing at the entrance to the sepulchre, spoke to them, for he said to them: "Come see the place where the Lord lay" (St. Matt. xxviii., 6). And on entering the sepulchre they saw the other angel seated within, who said to them: "Behold the place where they laid Him!" (St. Mark xvi., 6).²

The message which the first angel gave the women for the disciples was simply that Christ had risen (St. Matt. xxviii., 7). The message from the second angel was that Christ would go before His disciples into Galilee, where they should see Him (St. Mark xvi., 7). The Apostles were to see Christ that very day in Jerusalem (St. John xx., 19), yet the angel spoke of the meeting in Galilee, for that meeting was to be in fulfillment of a prophecy which Christ had made on the night before His death (St. Mark xiv., 28).

The women were penetrated with the fear which a manifestation of the supernatural inspires. The first angel had said to them, "Fear not;" and the words of the second angel were also reassuring, yet when they went out from the sepulchre they were trembling (St. Mark xvi., 8). With fear and great joy they ran to tell the disciples (St. Matt. xxviii., 8), but they said nothing to any one (in the way); for they were afraid (St. Mark xvi., 8). And Christ, meeting them, said to them: "All hail" (St. Matt. xxviii., 9).

² Quæritis in St. Mark xvi., 6, may be translated "sought" instead of "seek."

The fact that the women, coming up to worship Him, took hold of His feet (St. Matt. xxviii., 9), would go to show that He had not said to Mary Magdalene at the sepulchre, "Do not touch Me" (St. John xx., 17), but rather that He now said to her, as the words may be translated, "Do not cling to Me."

We can well believe that Mary Magdalene, willing that the others should precede her with the good tidings, had kept hold of Christ's feet, fearing that He would again disappear. It was the same Lord who in Galilee had been pleased when the woman who was a sinner kissed His feet (St. Luke vii., 45). Now He said: "Do not cling to Me," but honored Mary Magdalene above the other women, sending her to prophesy the Ascension (St. John xx., 17).

It was to women that the Resurrection was announced. And they were thus honored, not simply because they came to the sepulchre, but it was to be so. Peter and John came, but saw only the linen cloths and the napkin (St. John xx., 4-10).

At least five women were at the sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection. For St. Luke, having mentioned three by name—Mary Magdalene, Joanna and Mary of James—adds: "And the other women with them" (St. Luke xxiv., 10).

The Gospels show on comparison that two distinct groups of women heard the angelic announcement. Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Salome, who bought spices when the Sabbath was past, heard the Resurrection announced when the sun had risen (St. Mark xvi., 1-6). But the Gospel tells also of Joanna and her companions, who having prepared spices before the Sabbath (St. Luke xxiii., 55-56), came at early dawn (*orthrou batheos*) to the sepulchre and returned to tell the Apostles that they had found it empty, and had had a vision of angels announcing the Resurrection of the Lord (St. Luke xxiv., 1-8). This group of women, comparatively unknown, had the honor of being the first to whom the Resurrection was announced.

It was of Joanna and her companions that the two disciples on their way to Emmaus spoke, saying: "Certain women of our company affrighted us, having been at the sepulchre before it was light, and not finding His body, they came saying they had seen a vision of angels, who say that He is alive" (St. Luke xxiv., 22-23).³

The circumstances of the announcement to Joanna and her companions show it to be entirely distinct from that to Salome and her companions. One announcement was at early dawn, the other when the sun had risen. The first was made by two angels

³ Judging from the conversation of the two disciples, they had left the company of the apostles before the return of the women, who met the Lord in the way.

as they stood beside women who were within the sepulchre; the second was made by an angel to women who were yet outside of the sepulchre, and was confirmed by an angel whom they saw seated within when they entered.

Mary Magdalene may have been with the women who came at early dawn to the sepulchre (St. Luke xxiv., 1); but she must have left them before the apparition of the angels.

It was not immediately upon the arrival of Joanna and her companions that the angels appeared. These women were standing within the sepulchre, at a loss at not finding there the body of the Lord, before the angels stood by them, saying: "Why seek you the living among the dead?" and announced to them the Resurrection (St. Luke xxiv., 4-7).

The disciples were to be convinced first that the sepulchre was empty, and then that Christ had risen. To those who were yet incredulous of the Resurrection the one important fact was that the sepulchre was empty. The disciples of Emmaus told their unknown companion that those who went to the sepulchre that day found it even so as the women had said (St. Luke xxiv., 24); that is, they found that Christ was not there (St. Luke xxiv., 12; St. John xx., 3-10)⁴.

Though St. Luke, after telling of the coming of the women at early dawn, of their finding the sepulchre empty and of the announcement of the angels to them, mentions Mary Magdalene among the women who told these things (St. Luke xxiv., 10), yet he does not say that *each* of the women mentioned by name told *all* these things. It suffices, so far as Mary Magdalene's first visit is concerned, that she found the sepulchre empty, and in her own way made known the fact.

Having gathered together the recorded events of the Resurrection day, we may say, "The four Evangelists tell these things," though each does not tell all.

As St. Matthew is reconciled with St. John in regard to Mary Magdalene's first coming by the supposition that she and Mary the mother of James set out for the sepulchre at the beginning of the dawn, the Greek allowing of that interpretation, and as St. Mark is reconciled with St. John by the supposition that Mary Magdalene was not with Mary the mother of James and Salome as they approached the sepulchre, it not being said that they all three came together, so St. Luke is reconciled with St. John by the supposition that Mary Magdalene was not with Joanna and her companions when the angels appeared, it not being said that each of the women told all these things.

⁴ *Ipsium vero non invenerunt* (St. Luke xxiv., 24).

For though judging from each one of the Synoptic Evangelists, it seems most probable that Mary Magdalene heard the angelic announcement at her first coming to the sepulchre, the probability of the three to that effect, is outweighed by the certainty of the Fourth Evangelist to the contrary. It is not three against one, but the seeming probability of three against the certainty of one.

Now *if* St. Luke, when he says of the women whom he mentions by name that they told these things to the Apostles, means not merely the things in general concerning the sepulchre being found empty, and the Resurrection being announced, but that they told what they had learned (at least in part) under the very circumstances which he had just recorded, then there must have been a second Mary of James who came to the sepulchre. For she who came with Salome when the sun had risen, questioning who would roll away the stone (St. Mark xvi., 1-2), could not have learned at early dawn that the body of Christ was not in the sepulchre (St. Luke xxiv., 1, 3, 10, 22). There is no good reason why there may not have been among the followers of the Lord two women called Mary of James. There was more than one James even among the Apostles. Moreover, "Mary of James" might mean the mother, the wife, the daughter or the sister of James. She who came with Salome was the mother of James the Less (St. Mark xv., 40). That there may have been with Joanna a certain Mary of James, mentioned only once by St. Luke (Chap. xxiv, 10), and not mentioned at all by the other Evangelists, does not appear especially remarkable when we consider that there were several persons who are each mentioned in the Gospel only once. There is Susanna, mentioned only once, when Luke distinguishes her by name among the women disciples of Christ in Galilee (St. Luke viii., 3). Then there is the case of Alexander and Rufus. St. Mark describes Simon of Cyrene as the father of Alexander and Rufus (St. Mark xv., 21), yet these two sons of Simon had not been mentioned before nor are they mentioned afterward in the Gospel.

The early Christians would know who was meant by each Mary of James, just as they knew who was meant by Susanna, Alexander and Rufus. The two Marys might be called by the same name even though one of them had a distinctive name. The leader of the Apostles had the distinctive name of Peter; yet we find him sometimes called Simon (St. Luke xiv., 37; xxii., 31), notwithstanding the fact of there being another Apostle Simon.

There is a popular belief that (including Mary Magdalene) there were "three Marys" at the sepulchre. If this belief is the survival of a tradition to that effect it is easily seen how in the course of time the name of Mary came to be ascribed to Salome, she being closely

associated with Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James in the account of the Resurrection.⁵

St. Luke can be reconciled with St. Mark, and incidentally the three Marys can be accounted for on the supposition that the Mary of James mentioned by St. Luke was a different person from Mary the mother of James the Less, who with Mary Magdalene (and Salome) heard the Resurrection announced when the sun had risen.

Cleophas and his companion, who recognized the Lord at Emmaus on the day of the Resurrection (St. Luke xxiv., 13-31), returning to Jerusalem, were present at the apparition of Christ to the Apostles when it was late that same day (Comp. St. Luke xxiv., 33-41; St. John xx., 19-20). The two disciples are usually represented as arriving at Emmaus about sunset, because on reaching there they said to their unknown Companion: "Stay with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is now far spent." But even supposing that they did not exaggerate the lateness of the hour in urging Him to be their guest, who had made their hearts burn within them as He spoke (St. Luke xxiv., 32), still the Jewish day, as it ended with sunset, was far spent by about the ninth hour, at the time of the evening sacrifice. If they left Emmaus in the evening of the declining sun, that is to say, the late afternoon, they may well have reached Jerusalem before the day was ended, Emmaus being as is made known incidentally that before the rest of the Apostles saw only about seven miles from Jerusalem (St. Luke xxiv., 13). Considering the circumstances under which they had seen the Lord, they would be apt to think that they were the only ones who had seen Him, and they doubtless returned with eager haste, as those who have joyful and startling news to tell. On their return they were greeted with the announcement that the Lord was risen indeed, and had appeared to Simon (St. Luke xxiv., 33-34). And thus it is made known incidentally that before the rest of the Apostles saw the Lord Peter had seen Him, and had been the cause of others earning the blessedness of those who had not seen and yet believed (St. John xx., 29).

The two disciples found the eleven gathered together, and they found those who were with the eleven saying: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." Such seems to be the meaning of the sentence in St. Luke xxiv., 33-34. It could not have been the eleven who were expressing belief in the Resurrection, for they did not believe until they saw for themselves (St. Luke xxiv., 41; St. Mark xvi., 14).

⁵ St. Matthew's expression, "the other Mary," in verse 61, chapter xxvii., considering the connection in which it is used (see verse 56), implies that Salome's name was *not* Mary.

The story of Joanna and her companions concerning the empty sepulchre and the vision of angels seemed to the Apostles absurd (*deliramentum*), and they did not believe it (St. Luke xxiv., 10-11). They did not believe Mary Magdalene when she told them as they mourned and wept that the Lord was alive and had been seen by her (St. Mark xvi., 9-11); neither did they believe the two disciples (St. Mark xvi., 13). The two disciples themselves did not believe until they saw Christ break bread (St. Luke xxiv., 30-31); perhaps it was then that they noticed the wounds in His hands. The women believed the testimony of the angels; but the only ones of whom we read as believing on human testimony are the unknown men who greeted the returning disciples with the announcement: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon."

It was after Christ's Resurrection that there appeared to many, in the holy city, the many saints whose tombs were opened when the earth quaked and the rocks were rent at the death of Christ (St. Matt. xxvii., 52). Those apparitions are generally supposed to have taken place on the day of the Crucifixion, but the Evangelist who writes of them specifies that they occurred after Christ's Resurrection (St. Matt. xxvii., 53). The incredulity of the Apostles may have been increased by reports of the apparitions of those risen saints.

Christ had often told His Apostles that He would rise from the dead, but it is written that they did not understand Him (St. Luke xviii., 31-34).⁶ Before the Crucifixion they could not believe that He was to die, so they did not know what He meant when He spoke of rising again (St. Mark ix., 8-9). And when they were convinced of His death, still less were they prepared to believe in His Resurrection. They knew that He had brought Lazarus back to life, but never yet had any one been known to rise from the dead by his own power. Moreover, they would naturally resent the humiliation of being told of the Resurrection by others. After Joanna and her companions had come telling of the angelic announcement, other women came bringing messages from the angels and from the Lord (St. Matt. xxviii., 7-9), one of the women being Mary Magdalene, out of whom seven devils had gone forth. And she also told of the approaching Ascension, saying: "I have seen the Lord" (St. John xx., 18).

If Christ had risen, why had He not appeared to them, the chosen eleven? The day was almost ended, and they had not yet seen Him when the two disciples returned from Emmaus telling of

⁶ Renan says ("Vie de Jesus," 15 ed., 1876, a pp. 42) that the statement in the fourth Gospel that Peter and John on the morning of the resurrection as yet knew not the Scripture that Christ must rise from the dead (St. John xx., 9) is a flash of light showing that He had not foretold His resurrection. As if the Scripture at the time of Christ could mean the words of Christ to His apostles. Renan's "flash of light" seems to have been blinding.

having talked with Him in the way, and of His having made Himself known to them in the breaking of bread. It is not surprising to read that neither did the Apostles believe them (St. Mark xvi., 12-13). Though Peter had seen the Lord, as those who were with the eleven testified, still the Apostles were the men who even at the Last Supper were disputing among themselves which of them was accounted greatest (St. Luke xxii., 24). The very earnestness of their desire for the Resurrection may have stood in the way of their belief. It is true, men often believe what they wish to believe; yet when there is much at stake the fear of reaction in the near future will cause them to guard themselves carefully against the danger of being deceived. The object of their desire must then be clearly proved, even as though it were something they did not wish to believe.

The patriarch Jacob would not believe those who told him that the son whom he mourned as dead was alive, and had been seen in Egypt (Gen. xlv., 26).

It seems likely that when Christ appeared to the Apostles on the Resurrection day He appointed not only the mountain in Galilee where they were to meet Him (St. Matt. xxviii., 16), but also the time of their going into Galilee; since they did not go at once, as we might suppose they did from St. Matthew's Gospel, but remained in Jerusalem until the octave of the Resurrection day, the second Christian Sabbath, when Christ again appeared to them (St. John xx., 26).

Before they went into Galilee, even Thomas had been convinced of the reality of the Resurrection (St. John xx., 24-28). So that if it was some of the Apostles, and not some other disciples, who doubted when they saw the Lord on the mountain (St. Matt. xxviii., 17), it must be that they failed to recognize Him immediately, as some of them failed to recognize Him at the Sea of Tiberias (St. John xxi., 4), when He was not far from them (St. John xxi., 8).

We know that Peter and John had not been afraid to venture to the sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection; moreover, Cleophas and his companion conversing freely on that day, as they went to Emmaus, with one whom they thought was a stranger, spoke of some of their company having been to the sepulchre (St. Luke xxiv., 24). It would appear, therefore, that the fear which made the disciples gather together within closed doors (St. John xx., 10), was caused by hearing the report that they had stolen away the body of Christ (St. Matt. xxviii., 12-15). But that story of the "sleeping witnesses," even while repeated, was likely believed by few, if any, being too preposterous. The Apostles soon recovered from their fear.

Though it was not until after the descent of the Holy Ghost that

they came forward and preached to the people (Acts ii., 14), yet they did not then come forth as men who up to that time had been in hiding. Having journeyed to Galilee (St. Matt. xxviii., 16), they returned again to Judaea,⁷ where they saw Christ ascend into heaven (Acts i., 10-12), as He had prophesied through Mary Magdalene (St. John xx., 17-18),

AN OUTLINE OF THE FIRST EASTER.

The reasonable inferences drawn from the four Gospels make possible the following logical composite outline of the recorded events of the first Easter day.

When Saturday's sun had set Mary Magdalene, Salome and Mary the mother of James bought spices that, coming in the morning, they might anoint Jesus (St. Mark xvi., 1).

And at the beginning of the dawn, as Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James set out for the sepulchre, an angel rolled away the stone and terrified the guard (St. Matt. xxviii., 1-4).

Mary Magdalene, finding the sepulchre empty, departed in haste (St. John xx., 1-2).

The Resurrection was announced to Joanna and her companions (St. Luke xxiv., 4-8).

Peter and John ran to the sepulchre. And after they had departed Mary Magdalene, as she stood there weeping, saw two angels, and then she saw the Lord (St. John xx., 3-6).

Salome and Mary the mother of James arrived when the sun had risen (St. Mark xvi., 2-4).

The first angel announced the Resurrection (St. Matt. xxviii., 5-7).

The second angel confirmed the announcement (St. Mark xvi., 5-8).

The women met Christ in the way (St. Matt. xxviii., 9-10).

Some of the guard were bribed by the chief priests (St. Matt. xxviii., 11-15).

Cleophas and his companion recognized Christ at Emmaus, and were told on returning to Jerusalem of the apparition to Simon-Peter (St. Luke xxiv., 13-36).

And Christ appeared to the Apostles before the day was ended (St. John xx., 19-23).

A. G. EWING.

Washington, D. C.

⁷ The return of the apostles from Galilee to Judaea between the time of the resurrection and the ascension is not mentioned in the Gospel. It must be inferred from the fact that whereas they went into Galilee after the resurrection (St. Matt. xxviii., 16), yet it was from Judaea that they saw Christ ascend into heaven (St. Luke xxiv., 50-52; Acts i., 10-12).

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN FRANCE.

WHEN the present state of things in France is discussed by a French priest with a sympathizing American or Englishman the ever recurring question is: How can a Catholic country allow her government to trample on her religion? This seems an insoluble problem to many a foreign mind.

To solve it, it is necessary to answer first another question: In what degree is France a Catholic country?

Not every Frenchman, even well informed, would give the same answer to that question. There are in the country elements discrepant enough to justify widely different appreciations. Six years ago, before the recrudescence of the persecution and the havoc it has wrought, it was possible, by carefully selecting the features, to draw two pictures of Catholic France, the one glowing with the most splendid colors, the other gloomy and desponding. A blending of both pictures might be said to reproduce exact reality.

It was possible to say that the development of Catholic life in the past century had been wonderful; the old religious orders were reëstablished and flourishing; many new ones had been founded; it may be questioned whether France had ever numbered more members of religious societies; certainly the nuns had never been so numerous. The Catholics had studded the country with their free schools, which they maintained out of their own purse, without any help from the State; fifteen thousand Christian Brothers, besides other congregations, were teaching in the boys' schools. It is hardly possible to estimate the number of the teaching Sisters. Catholic charity had done wonders in the way of building hospitals and founding Sisterhoods for the care of the aged, the sick and the destitute. It will be sufficient to mention that the Little Sisters of the Poor are a French order. Many of the clergy had displayed a multiform activity; there were renowned preachers, devoted parish priests. New institutions had sprung into existence to meet new exigencies; there were Catholic workmen's clubs, young men's associations, and so forth. More missionaries were sent from France to the heathen than from any other country, and France gave them more money than all the rest of the Catholic world together. Crowds went to the celebrated shrines of Lourdes, Montmartre, La Salette—cheered, sung and rose to the highest pitch of enthusiasm. A thirst for knowledge of every kind spread among the younger clergy; the Catholic universities had been established to supply this want, and did very good work. It may be safely said that since the Revolution the French clergy has never been able to show such a body of learned men as now.

At the same time it might be pointed out that the country churches were becoming more and more empty; that many a priest had a congregation of five or six old crones to listen to his sermon on Sundays; that in the big towns hundreds of thousands were little better than heathens, and if, on a great occasion, the walls of a church were nearly bursting with the multitudes they contained, that there were much greater crowds outside who did not care at all about religion; that, in spite of schools and colleges, the cultivated section, and especially the masculine intellect of the nation, for the greater part escaped the influence of the Church; that there was a malignant disposition in the public whenever a priest was concerned. The scandals given by Freethinkers or Republican politicians were easily condoned; but clerical scandals, true or false, were reverberated by public opinion like a gigantic sounding-board.

If to be baptized in the Catholic Church is to be a Catholic, then France is a Catholic nation. The Protestants and Jews, although a power in the land, are few. Among the others the number of the unbaptized, in spite of a steady increase in the large towns, is still very small. Those who are married or buried without the rites of the Church are more numerous, but form on the whole an insignificant minority. The great bulk of the French nation receive the Sacraments of Baptism, the Eucharist at least once (on the day of First Communion), are married before the priest and have the prayers of the Church at their burial, and probably a considerable majority of them receive the sacraments before dying.

How is it, then, that these men send to the Chambers of Deputies members who are bent upon destroying the Church and her sacraments? If we are to judge of a people by its elected representatives, France is far from being a Catholic nation. Not only is the majority bitterly anti-clerical, which is, in fact, synonymous with anti-religious, but in the Opposition itself there are many members whom the Catholics have voted for, though they are not Catholics, but only Liberals, ready to concede liberty to a creed in which they do not believe and to a Church whose beneficial influence they appreciate, while not deeming it of Divine origin.

Of course, electoral corruption accounts for some elections; but it cannot account for all. In some parts there has been no corruption; in many, the large majorities could not be obtained by corruption. It cannot account for the fact that the true practical Catholics are few in number among the Deputies. To find out a more complete explanation, we must study the present attitude of the French mind toward religion.

In many cases the religious practices that subsist are mere formalism, rites that have to be performed because they are traditional;

that are gone through sometimes reluctantly, as a concession to social conventions, sometimes with a fond attachment to them, because of the halo time and habit have surrounded them with, and because they are family rites. But these people, who are married and buried with the ceremonies of the Church, do they or did they believe? This is the crucial question. Certainly there are some of them who do not believe. Atheists are married in church to please their bride; some of the most violent antagonists of Catholicism have been carried before the altar after their death. Even the last sacraments are often received because "it looks so much better for the family." Rites, not faith.

But God only knows who has faith and who has not. There are no statistics of believers and unbelievers. If we are to gauge the depth of French Catholicism we must find some outward sign of the inmost dispositions of the soul. It seems to me that the best sign is the usual attendance at church on Sundays.

I know very well that practice is not always coterminous with faith; that some people go to church with nothing but a vague and indeterminate faith in a God; that more people, keeping their faith alive in the recesses of their hearts, do not go to church out of fear or negligence. Yet, on the whole, and failing a better sign, I think attendance at Mass—and Easter Communion, too—a fairly good barometer of Catholic life in France.

Judging from that standpoint, there are vast differences between one part of France and another. In nearly all the industrial towns there are great masses of population that seem impermeable to religion. They never go to church, unless it be for a wedding or a funeral. Nobody has obtained for Paris the same religious statistics as Mr. Charles Booth compiled for London; but, from what I hear, I should say that not one-tenth of the population goes to church; and if we consider only the quarters inhabited by work-people, the proportion would be still smaller. For instance, in the parish of Clignancourt there are 121,000 souls, and to minister to their spiritual needs one church and two chapels, neither of which is very large. It is evident that if any considerable proportion of the population came to church, these buildings would soon be found inadequate.

There are rural districts in which the case is quite as bad, and the non-religious area is much larger than is supposed even by many Frenchmen, and is spreading. In all the country around Paris—in Touraine, Champagne, Burgundy and several regions of the south—the practical Catholics are the exception and the others are the rule. And those others are not only indifferent; they are often hostile, and of late years they have become more and more so.

Amongst the workmen of the towns and the peasants of those regions there is a general distrust and hatred of the priest, though not always of the particular priest they happen to know. The favorite amusement of more than one Mayor and petty village tyrant consists in worrying his priest from the beginning of January to the end of December.

That such centres and regions should send anti-clerical Deputies to Parliament is quite natural and logical. When in a village the Sunday congregation is composed of eight or ten women without a single male worshiper, and in election time two-thirds of the votes cast go to the government candidate, we cannot say that this is the result of electoral pressure or corruption. The minority does not even represent Catholics, but moderates who are for peace and order.

It is more difficult to understand the vote of some other provinces. Normandy, for instance, votes for the most part against the government; yet, although things are better there than in the last mentioned countries, the male worshipers cannot be said to be in a majority; but there is a strong conservative current in that province. But what is much more difficult to explain is that some regions where nearly all people of either sex go to Mass and to Communion at Easter elect only anti-religious members. Local interests which have a liking for the stronger side, together with a distrust of the political action of the priest, offer the most plausible explanation.

To sum up, there are large regions and populous centres where religion cannot be said to exist (except in the form of some dead ceremonies) outside small groups of population, and where a spirit of bitter anti-clericalism is prevalent. There are also large regions where the priest is still respected and influential, where religion is practiced by a not inconsiderable body, but where the abstainers are at least as numerous. And there are some parts of Brittany, Flanders, the central mountains and the Alps where nearly the whole of the population is practically Catholic. I say "some parts," for even the best provinces have black spots, and Brittany itself has its good number of Freethinkers.

On the whole, the practical Catholics are certainly a minority amongst the men, and perhaps amongst the women, too. It is impossible to give figures, even approximate figures; but we may say that this minority, very weak in some parts, if taken altogether, is still pretty strong and has given those proofs of its vitality which I mentioned before and whose splendor created the delusion of a Catholic France. Therefore it should be able to make itself respected.

There has been much discussion about the causes of that decline

of the faith in France. English and American priests often say it comes from the special formation of the French clergy. But the problem cannot be dismissed so easily. It is possible, nay, let us say it is true, that the French clergy, in consequence of their education, have kept too much aloof from the people of their time. It is true that, being men, they have often fallen below their ideal. But to lay the whole blame on the clergy, without taking into account the difficulties they had to encounter, would be very unjust.

The intellectual heritage of the eighteenth century philosophers, of the Voltaires and Diderots, has remained with the French; their thought has been instilled into the French soul, diffused through the French atmosphere, the spirit of scoffing, the dry light of rationalistic reason, the aversion to anything mysterious and beyond man are still with us; they create a state of mind easily receptive of negation and doubt, repugnant to faith. I doubt whether the Church has elsewhere, except perhaps in Germany for other reasons, such a formidable obstacle to overcome when addressing the intellectual class.

Moreover, the great democratic surge that has flooded France has been prejudicial to the Church. Catholicism in itself is neither for nor against democracy in itself; it has lent itself to all kinds of régimes. But democracy, on account of historical circumstances, may be for or against Catholicism. Now in France, where the leveling tendency is very strong and the uprooting tendency has been exhibited several times on a large scale, the great sweep of democracy carries away before it all that belonged to the old order. The Church, of course, in itself is not more of the old than of the new order; but, in fact, the Church in France occupied a prominent place in that old order; it must be swept away with it. All that was up must be down; the nobility was up; we have put it down; the Church was up; we will put it down. This is how even the peasants who go to Mass vote against the priest's candidate, as they vote against the Count's or Baron's candidate, to prove that they are independent of the two influences that ruled over them in former times—the Presbytery and the Castle. The case is very different in England and America, where the Catholic Church has not been in power, or not for a long time, and where the leveling tendency of democracy is much less radical. Democracy, flushed with the pride of her triumph, is one of the chief causes of anti-clericalism in France. A different formation of the clergy might have averted some of the evils it has inflicted; but our past being what it is—and we cannot change it now—it was impossible to prevent them completely.

At the same time the spirit of industrialism, that generates the

spirit of materialism, has averted the minds of our generation from religion. But this is not special to France, and I shall lay no stress on it.

There are many other causes. Those that will read that penetrating book "*L'Anti-cléricalisme*," by one of the most distinguished French writers, Emile Faguet, will understand that the existence and growth of that feeling is not due only to deficiencies of the clergy.

A sedulous care has been taken to nourish and foster it. A propaganda has been strenuously maintained that is at the same time violent and skillful. Irreligion has its apostles, sincerely convinced that the Church is the greatest hindrance to progress; that she is the mother of darkness, and should be crushed and suppressed to promote the happiness of mankind. In some of these earnest and narrow minds this idea has taken root and absorbed all other considerations, so that it looks like a monomania. And politics have their intriguers, their *arrivistes* as they are called in France, men who want to succeed by any means; and they know very well that anti-clericalism is the best spring-board to help you to jump into a seat; they know that the greatest part of the electoral struggle consists in hurling at your adversary or parrying the dreaded epithet of clerical. Knowing this, they harp on that chord as frequently as possible and so inflame the already burning passions of the multitude.

The instrument of the anti-religious propaganda has been two-fold: the press and the schoolmaster. Not only the great newspapers of Paris, but still more the local papers, have been instrumental in creating an atmosphere of hatred and distrust around the priest. By their personal attacks upon men whom their readers knew, by inventing scandals or raising a great noise around real ones, they have done more harm than the biggest papers of the capital. And in this matter, as in many others, the children of this world have been wiser than the children of light. The children of light had their papers, too; but the others were better informed, more alert, and, being spiced with the additional zest of scandal, commanded a greater circulation.

The schoolmaster has been pampered and flattered by the anti-clerical governments, that he might be set up in every village against the priest, that he might become "the priest of secularism." He was carefully trained for that mission and rewarded with preferment if he fulfilled it with zeal. When the impulse he gave was in accordance with an already existing tendency, his influence soon overpowered the priest; he was the great electoral agent, the real power behind the Mayor and the Municipal Council. The neutral school has remained a fiction; wherever the well-known sentiments of the

population did not enjoin prudence, the State school has been an anti-clerical school. The schoolmaster is largely responsible for the present phase of anti-clericalism, and is proud of it; for it is not deemed necessary now to keep up the old fiction of neutrality.

Anti-clericalism is the outcome of historical circumstances, national tendencies and an indefatigable propagandism. This flame that has burnt steadily for such a long time has been fanned by the Dreyfus case into a great conflagration, which is still raging and will rage for years. Many of the so-called champions of truth and innocence were simply enemies of the Church that spied a good opportunity and chose a coign of vantage from which they could deal their blows with greater force. On that ill-chosen ground a great battle was accepted, fought and lost. All the inimical forces—intellectual, social, political—were brought to bear at the same time on the same point. They are now storming the citadel, and one of the phases of the storming is the Separation Law.

To understand the meaning of that law it was necessary to state clearly the situation, the frame of mind of the legislators and the country. The separation of State and Church, although condemned in theory, may give good practical results, as in the United States, because separation there does not mean oppression. It does in France.

It is evident from what has been said about public opinion and the trend of French politics that the law cannot have been framed so as to give liberty to the Church. The aim of the predominant faction is the destruction of the Church. The old hypocritical pretences of distinguishing between clericalism and religion have been cast aside. Some retain them still because they cherish self-delusion; some, by sheer love of hypocrisy, cling to it when it has ceased to be necessary. But many are candid enough to say that, all religion being prejudicial to society, they aim at the abolition of Christianity. These men have helped to frame and carry the law; we cannot expect that law to be favorable to the Church.

At the same time they know the vitality of the Catholic religion. They have no hope of strangling it at once; the death they try to cause is death by atrophy. For that reason they introduced into the law some liberal provisions as a bait to make it accepted.

Whether it was better to make the most of the facilities granted and risk the dangers of the law, or to face the formidable consequences of a refusal and a resistance to the established powers, was a matter of opinion before the Pope spoke. Many good Catholics, quite sincere, intelligent and cultivated people, thought that the law should be accepted, although reluctantly and with precautions to minimize its effect. A petition, signed by celebrated Catholic lay-

men, was sent to the Bishop to that effect. To decry them was unjust; there was much to say on their side, and much on the other side, too.

Such was the situation—a law framed with the intention of injuring the Church, yet presenting some advantages, and a divided opinion in Catholic circles, when the Pope's word fell like a thunderbolt, cleared the clouds and effected unity.

The law was to be rejected. No associations were to be formed according to the Separation Law, because they were contrary to the constitution of the Church; future events had to be awaited and confronted. It was a bold decision; its ready acceptance by the French clergy was a heroic deed, for it might mean the loss of all their present means of subsistence, the confiscating of all church property and the closing of the churches. Now the assent was not only unanimous; it was joyful. There was clapping of hands and exulting of hearts in many a village presbytery—and the village priests would have to suffer most—when the answer of the Pope was known.

The next day after the publication of the encyclical the *Times* characterized it as very apostolic, but not prudent. Apostolic it was, undoubtedly; but now that the first smoke has cleared off, it appears to many Catholic minds that it was very wise, too. It was certainly strong and bold, but in a decisive crisis a strong and bold action is often the most prudent course. It spread dismay among our allies, the Moderates; but it spread dismay among our adversaries, too, and they were some time before recovering from their surprise and deciding what they should do.

What will they do? What is to be expected? What will happen to us? A forecast is very difficult; so many circumstances may spring up that are not foreseen. One thing is certain, that much suffering is in store for the French Catholics. But suffering is a tonic; it may give strength and awaken dormant energies. The government know it; they intend to dole out that suffering in small quantities, to let it drip, now here and now there, so that it may occasion the twitching of a nerve, but not a convulsion of the whole body. How far they will be able to carry out this policy remains to be seen.

According to ministerial declarations, no churches are to be closed, "not one door, not one window." These declarations are most likely sincere, since they are in accordance with the governmental plan of avoiding disturbances as much as possible; nevertheless, they are but straws in the wind; we cannot trust them, especially when the wind is threatening to become a tempest. Suppose the Ministers intend to keep their word: who knows how long they will be in

office? We have the precedent of the congregations. Waldeck-Rousseau was the President of the Cabinet; he had framed a law that was certainly not a liberal law, but did not seem intended to crush all religious associations. Its chief defect lay in its arbitrary character; it was very difficult for a religious order to get authorized; an act of Parliament, preceded by a long inquiry, was necessary. But to dissolve a congregation, a simple decree issued by a Minister was sufficient. The government could suppress any congregation at any time without giving any reason, and there was no recourse at law against it. But then Waldeck-Rousseau gave assurances that the law was made only against some militant orders, such as the Jesuits and the Assumptionists; that the others had only to submit and would be allowed to live in peace. Many complied, sued for authorization and sent in the information required. Then Waldeck-Rousseau disappeared, Combes came in his place and executed the law most ruthlessly, without any regard to the promises of his predecessor. Not *one* congregation got the authorization; the information they had given was used against them; many that were authorized before were suppressed by decrees, and as a result thousands and thousands of men and women have sought religious liberty outside the frontiers of France.

It is therefore plain that a Minister's word is but a straw in the wind. The anti-clerical mob in the street and anti-clerical opinion in the press may become too strong for the intended moderation of the Ministers, and nobody knows what unexpected developments the entanglement of the social with the religious question may lead to. The advance of the lower classes may baffle the most skillful calculations. The future is a blank on that point.

Even if no churches are closed, much harm may be done. The clergy will be liable to be fined and imprisoned for celebrating public worship against the regulations of the law. The priests under twenty-six years of age will be called back to the barracks. Most probably church property will be confiscated, because that is not likely to cause disturbances. In December that property will be sequestered, and after a year assigned to some secular charitable institution. So many of the *Petits Seminaires* will be wiped out of existence in the midst of general indifference.

In spite of the efforts of the government, but as a consequence of their doings, a great struggle is beginning. Those who were chiefly afraid of death by atrophy rejoice at it. But that joy cannot but be mingled with some heaviness of heart if we think of the difficulties to be overcome, of the ruins and wrecks we must be prepared for, of the length of time this distressful period may last. No exact comparison can be drawn from the Kulturkampf. The

German priests had a great advantage; they had their populations at their back. Many French priests are captains without troops; they will have to fight single-handed or with a handful of retainers. It will be a hard fight, and the harder morally if it is not materially hard.

The two armies as yet have done nothing but skirmishing work; each tries to get information about the strategy of the other side. The two general staffs are observing each other. I mean the Assembly of the Bishops and the Masonic Grand Lodge. Those two non-official councils may be said to be now more powerful in France than both houses of Parliament. What the Masonic Grand Lodge decides the Parliament will vote, and it will be executed as far as the resistance of the Catholics, led by the Bishops, will allow of it.

Even if the government came to some compromise and altered the law so as to make it acceptable to the Pope, the ground would be shifted, the conflict would not be so fierce, but the struggle would go on, because it is not against a few men sitting in debate Catholicism has to fight, but against a state of mind created and fostered by many powerful influences.

To conclude, however obscure the conditions of the future struggle may be, it is certain the French Catholics will have to fight hard for their religion. They will lose much; but their losses will be compensated if a number of them gain strength and acquire that toughness which in the end tires out all persecutors. No great upheaval, no sudden overturning of the government is to be expected, but a gradual strengthening of the religious fibre in the Catholic body is to be hoped for. A good effect that the present situation may have is to help Catholics and the clergy to realize a situation which has been somewhat obscured by the exaggerations of high-flown oratory. It is time to abandon that fiction of 36,000,000 of Catholics oppressed by 26,000 Freemasons. It is always good to know one's ground and dangerous to believe the numbers of the enemy are weak when they are strong. We are, in fact, a minority oppressed by a majority. The Freemasons are the leaders of the oppression, but they do not stand alone; they are surrounded by dense multitudes. We have to teach that majority that we have equal rights with them. This is where we stand; the position will appear more and more clearly as the withdrawal of State aid separates the faithful from the rest.

Another good effect of the present situation may be the reorganization of the parish system. In the irreligious regions its effects are deplorable. The parishes being mostly small, young priests are sent there even without having served as curates before, new-fledged from the *Grand Séminaire*. They are full of zeal, ready to work

for the salvation of souls. After a few months their zeal has been wrecked upon the solid rock of the indifference or hostility of their parishioners. They are soon convinced that nothing is to be done, and set down to live a life of isolation and idleness. They have nothing to do, because nobody comes to them, and many shun even their approach. Their catechism is their only occupation, and then the peasants scoff at them for doing nothing. These priests are lost forces.

It is the opinion of many a thoughtful Catholic that such regions should be treated as missionary countries, and the want of resources may lead to that solution. The small parishes with no good-will in the population will be unable to maintain a priest. Why then not have here and there centres where a few priests would live together, sheltered from the terrible dangers and depressing effects of isolation, and whence they would radiate to evangelize the neighborhood? This is a possibility which the pressure of events may convert into a fact.

So the dark outlook of the present hour is not without its glimpses of hope. The purifying and strengthening effect of sorrow may impart a new life to the Church. We are now taking a plunge into the unknown, and it may refresh and revigorate us. But the ways God is preparing to use to bring about that end are unfathomable to man.

ABBE HERMELINE.

Paris, France.

PREACHING AND POPULAR ACTION.

PÍUS X., POPE, TO HIS VENERABLE BRETHREN THE ARCHBISHOPS
AND BISHOPS OF ITALY.

Venerable Brethren, Health and the Apostolic Benediction:

WITH our soul full of fear for the strict account we shall have to give one day to the Prince of Pastors, Jesus Christ, with regard to the flock entrusted to us by Him, we pass our days in continual anxiety to preserve the faithful, as far as possible, from the most pernicious evils by which human society is at present afflicted. Hence we regard as addressed to us the word of the prophet: "Cry, lift up thy voice like a trumpet" (Is. lviii., 1); and we fail not, now by word of mouth and now by letter, to warn, beseech, reprehend, exciting, above all, the zeal of our brethren in

the episcopate so that each of them may exercise the most eager vigilance in the portion of the fold over which the Holy Spirit has set him.

The cause which induces us to raise our voice anew is of the gravest moment. It is a question demanding all the attention of your mind and all the energy of your pastoral office against a disorder from which the most baleful effects are already experienced; and if it is not removed with a strong hand in the most radical manner, consequences still more fatal will be felt in the progress of years. We have, in fact, before us letters from not a few of you, Venerable Brethren—letters full of sadness and tears, deploring the spirit of *insubordination* and *independence* displayed here and there amidst the clergy. All too surely a poisonous atmosphere largely corrupts men's minds in our days, and the deadly effects are those which the Apostle St. Jude formerly described: "These men in truth defile the flesh and despise dominion and blaspheme majesty" (Jude i., 8); that is, besides the most degrading corruption of manners there is an open contempt for authority and for those who exercise it. But that this spirit should penetrate in any wise into the sanctuary and infect those to whom the words of Ecclesiasticus ought most fittingly to be applied: "Their generation obedience and love" (iii., 1)—this is what overwhelms us with grief. And it is especially amongst young priests that this unhappy spirit is doing damage, new and reprehensible theories with regard to the very nature of obedience spreading themselves amongst them. And, what is more serious, as if to acquire new recruits for the growing troop of rebels, such maxims are being propagated more or less secretly amongst the young who in the enclosures of the seminaries prepare themselves for the priesthood.

Wherefore we consider it a duty, Venerable Brethren, to make an appeal to your conscience in order that, laying aside all hesitation, you should, with vigorous minds and not less vigorous firmness, exert yourselves to destroy this evil seed, fruitful in destructive consequences. Always remember that the Holy Spirit has placed you to rule. Remember the command of St. Paul to Titus: "Rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee" (ii., 15). Require rigorously from priests and clerics that obedience which is absolutely obligatory on all the faithful, but constitutes the chief part of the sacred duty of priests.

To prevent effectually the multiplication of these quarrelsome souls, it will be well, Venerable Brethren, ever to bear in mind the sublime warning of the Apostle to Timothy: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man" (I. Timothy v., 22). It is in truth the facility of admitting to sacred orders that naturally opens the way to a mul-

tiplication of people in the sanctuary who *do not increase joy*. We know that there are towns and dioceses where, far from there being cause to lament a scarcity of clergy, the number of priests is much greater than the faithful need. Ah, Venerable Brethren, what ground can there be for imposing hands so frequently? If the scarcity of the clergy cannot be a sufficient reason for haste in a matter of such gravity, where the clergy are more numerous than the requirements demand nothing excuses from the most delicate caution and the greatest rigor in the selection of those who are to receive the honor of the priesthood. Nor can the urgency of the aspirants lessen the fault of a too ready facility. The priesthood, instituted by Jesus Christ for the eternal salvation of souls, is surely not a human profession or office to which every one who desires, for whatever reason, has a right freely to devote himself. Let the Bishops then promote to sacred orders not according to the desires and pretexts of those who aspire to the priesthood, but as the Council of Trent prescribes, according to the necessities of the dioceses; and in promoting this they can only select those who are really fit, dismissing those who have inclinations contrary to the priestly vocation, the chief of which inclinations are a disregard for discipline and the pride of mind that begets it.

In order that youth who display qualities suitable to the sacred ministry may not be wanting we wish, Venerable Brethren, to insist with greater earnestness on what we have already pointed out several times, namely, the obligation that rests upon you—a most serious one before God—to watch over and further with the utmost solicitude the right conduct of the seminaries. Your priests will be as you have trained them. Most important is the letter on this subject which was addressed to you on the 8th December, 1902, by our most prudent predecessor, as a testament from his long Pontificate. To that we desire to add nothing new; we shall merely remind you of the rules it lays down; and we strongly recommend the immediate execution of our orders, published through the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, on the concentration of the seminaries, especially for the study of philosophy and theology, in order to secure in this way the great advantage resulting from the separation of the greater seminaries from the smaller ones and the other advantage, not less great, attaching to the necessary instruction of the clergy.

Let the seminaries be jealously maintained in the spirit that properly belongs to them, and let them remain *exclusively* destined to prepare youth not for civil careers, but for the exalted mission of ministers of Christ. Let philosophy and theology and the kindred sciences, especially Sacred Scripture, be studied in accordance with

the Pontifical directions and with the teaching of St. Thomas recommended by our venerated predecessor so often, and by us in the Apostolic Letter of the 23d January, 1904. Let the Bishops, then, exercise the most scrupulous vigilance over the masters in their doctrines, recalling to a sense of duty those who run after certain dangerous novelties and removing, without any regard, from the office of teaching all who do not profit by the warnings received. Frequentation of the universities is not to be permitted to young clerics except for very grave reasons and with the greatest precautions on the part of the Bishops. Seminary students are to be absolutely forbidden to take part in any way in outside agitations, and we accordingly prohibit them from reading papers and periodicals except, in the case of the latter, some of sound principles that the Bishop may deem suitable for study by the students. Let discipline be ever maintained with increasing vigor and vigilance. Lastly, there must be in every seminary the spiritual director, a man of more than ordinary prudence and experienced in the ways of Christian perfection, who is, with indefatigable zeal, to train the youth in that solid piety which is the first foundation of the spiritual life. These rules, Venerable Brethren, where conscientiously and firmly followed, will afford you a sure guarantee of seeing growing up around you a clergy that will be your joy and your crown.

Otherwise the disorder of insubordination and independence, which we now lament, will go a good deal further in some of the young clergy and cause much greater harm, because there are not wanting those who are so much a prey to this reprobate spirit that, abusing the sacred office of preaching, they openly act as its promoters and apostles to the ruin and scandal of the faithful.

Our predecessor on the 31st July, 1894, through the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, drew the attention of the Ordinate Pharaohs who had been removed slept in peace until our own regulations laid down in this Pontifical document, laying an obligation in this respect on the consciences of the Bishops, so that the words of the Prophet Nahum may never be applicable to any of them: "Thy shepherds have slumbered" (iii., 18). No one can have power to preach "unless he first be approved of in life, knowledge and morals" (Conc. Trid. Sess. V., cap. 2, "De Reformatione"). Priests from other dioceses should not be admitted to preach without letters of testimony from their own Bishop. Let the subject of their sermons be that indicated by the Divine Redeemer when He said: "Preach the Gospel" (Mark xvi., 15), "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Mark xxviii., 20). Or, according to the comment of the Council of Trent, "announcing to them the vices they should avoid and the virtues they should follow

in order that they may escape eternal punishment and attain heavenly glory" (Loc. cit.). Then, let arguments better suited to journalistic campaigning and to academic halls than to the pulpit be banished altogether from that holy place; let moral preaching be preferred to sermons that are, to say the least, fruitless; and let the preacher speak "not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in showing of the spirit and power" (I. Cor. ii., 4). Wherefore the principal source from which preaching will derive its strength should be the Sacred Scriptures, understood not according to the private judgment of minds most frequently blinded by passions, but according to the traditions of the Church and the interpretations of the holy fathers and the Councils.

You should judge, Venerable Brethren, conformably to these rules of those to whom you entrust the ministry of the divine word. And whenever you find that any of them, more concerned for their own interests than for those of Jesus Christ, more anxious for worldly applause than for the good of souls, depart from them, warn and correct them, and if that is not sufficient, remove them inexorably from an office for which they prove themselves completely unworthy. Vigilance and severity of this kind should be all the more readily employed by you because the ministry of preaching belongs specially to you and is a chief part of the episcopal office; and whoever outside your ranks exercises it does so in your name and in your place. Whence it follows that you are always responsible before God for the manner in which the bread of the divine word is dispensed to the faithful. To relieve ourselves from all responsibility, we point out to all Ordinaries and enjoin upon them the duty of discontinuing or suspending, after charitable warnings, even during a course of sermons, any preacher, secular or regular, who does not entirely obey the injunctions contained in the above mentioned instruction of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. It were better that the faithful should content themselves with simple homilies and explanations of the catechisms given by their parish priests than to be present at sermons that do more harm than good.

Another field in which, amongst the young clergy, too much scope and too great a stimulus is found for maintaining and advocating exemption from every bond of legitimate authority is that of the so-called popular Christian action. Not indeed, Venerable Brethren, because this action is in itself reprehensible, or from its nature conduces to the contempt of authority; but because many, misunderstanding its character, have voluntarily abandoned the rules which were laid down for its promotion by our predecessor of immortal memory.

We refer, as you are aware, to the Instructions on the Popular

Christian Action, which went forth by order of Leo XIII. from the Sacred Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs on the 27th January, 1902, and which were transmitted to each of you to be carried out in your respective dioceses. These instructions we, on our part, maintain, and in the fullness of our power we renew each and all of the regulations, as we also confirm and renew all the orders issued by ourselves for the occasion in the "Motu Proprio" of the 18th December, 1903, "De Populari Actione Christiana Moderanda," and in the circular letter of our beloved son, the Cardinal Secretary of State, dated the 28th July, 1904.

As to the foundation and direction of newspapers and periodicals, the clergy must faithfully observe what is prescribed in Article 42 of the Apostolic Constitution "Officiorum:" (1) "Clergymen are to be prohibited from directing (*moderanda*) newspapers or periodicals without the previous consent of the Ordinaries." So, also, without the previous consent of the Ordinary none of the clergy can publish any writing of the kind, whether on a religious or moral subject, or of a moral character, or of a character merely technical. Prior to the foundation of circles and societies the rules and statutes must be examined and approved of by the Ordinary. No priest or cleric can give conferences (lectures) on Popular Christian Action or any other subject without the permission of the Ordinary of the place. Any language that may inspire aversion to the higher classes is and must be regarded as altogether contrary to the true spirit of Christian charity. And in like manner are to be condemned in Catholic publications any terms which, breathing of unhealthy novelty, deride the piety of the faithful and point to *new orientations of the Christian life, new directions of the Church, new aspirations of the modern soul, a new social vocation of the clergy, a new Christian civilization* and similar things. Whilst it is praiseworthy for the priests, especially those of them who are young, to go to the people, they must nevertheless proceed in this matter with due obedience to authority and to the commands of the ecclesiastical superiors. And in devoting themselves, with the subordination already mentioned, to Popular Christian Action, it must be their noble duty "to rescue the children of the people from ignorance of spiritual and eternal things, and to induce them with active kindness to live honestly and virtuously; to strengthen the adults in the faith, removing contrary influences, and to fortify them in the practice of the Christian life; to promote amongst the Catholic laity those institutions that are truly efficacious for the moral and material improvement of the masses of the people; to uphold, above all, the principles of evangelical justice and charity which equitably apply to all the rights and duties of civil society. . . . But let them always bear in mind that even in

the midst of the people the priest ought to preserve inviolate his august character as a minister of God, being placed at the head of his brethren *animarum causa* (S. Greg. M. Regul. Past. Pars. ii., c. vii.) ; any mode of devoting himself to the people to the detriment of the priestly dignity and to the prejudice of ecclesiastical duties and discipline can only be reproved" (Ep. Encycl., 8th December, 1902).

For the rest, Venerable Brethren, to raise an effectual barrier against this extravagance of idea and this extension of the spirit of independence we, by our authority, absolutely prohibit all clerics and priests henceforward to give their names to any society that does not depend on the Bishops. In a more special manner and in particular we prohibit them under penalty, for the clerics, of inability to take holy orders and, for the priests, of suspension *ipso facto a divinis*, from becoming members of the National Democratic League, whose programme was issued from Roma-Torette on the 20th October, 1905, and whose statutes were printed in the same year, without the name of the author, by the Provisional Committee at Bologna.

Such are the directions which the solicitude of the Apostolic Office demanded from us, having regard to the present condition of the clergy in Italy and the importance of the subject. It only remains for us to excite your zeal anew, Venerable Brethren, in order that these arrangements and regulations be quickly and fully carried out in your dioceses. Prevent the evil where fortunately it does not yet show itself; suppress it speedily where it is springing up, and where unhappily it is already ripe extirpate it with an energetic and resolute hand. Laying this matter on your consciences we implore for you from God the spirit of prudence and the necessary firmness. And to this end we impart to you, with all our heart, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 28th July, 1906, the third year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

THE REPLY OF THE BISHOPS.

“**G**RATIAS agamus Domino Deo Nostro!” Is not this the feeling that leaps forth from all our souls at this moment when the doors of this palace close upon the first meeting of the Bishops of France for nearly a century, and is it not with a unanimous cry of gratitude that we wish to hail this hour, henceforth to be held historic, that gives back to the Church of France one of her dearest liberties?

Since the opening of last century we have been deprived of this right of assembly, which is of the essence of every duly constituted society, a law unjustly grafted upon a contract held us powerless in our isolation and forbade us to pool our lights and energies.

Six Cardinals could not meet to deliberate without transgressing the law, and their signatures placed singly and without converse of any sort to a document drafted by one of them were described as wrongful. And this the more, if a document as unimpeachable in matter as restrained in form, was put forth to the public with the signatures, given one by one, of the greater number of the Bishops of France. It seemed, indeed, as if the public authorities had no powers sufficient to deal with such a crime.

The victims amongst us so gloriously smitten, three years ago, in the name of the legislation now abolished, will rejoice over their past sufferings all the more sincerely that they have given to Rome and to the world the opportunity of seeing that in France the episcopate is of one voice and one mind on all questions of patriotism and of faith, and that the will of the Holy Father, known to all, will ever be the last word of our resolutions.

Thanks be to God, and after God to the august Pontiff with whose authorization and under whose eyes we are about to pray and take counsel together!

Most Holy Father, the law was discussed, as I can witness, though your Holiness was considering the directions to be given to the Church of France when the hour of its execution should come; and the best means of understanding the situation such as it really is, appeared to your paternal judgment to be a consultation of the episcopate considering in the fullest freedom the questions proposed by your supreme authority.

From that time the idea of a plenary assembly, now at length possible, ran in a current of enthusiasm through all our Catholic people, and from all parts rose a hosanna of gratitude to the Pastor of Pastors who gave to the French episcopate so signal a mark of confidence. Unanimously, therefore, Most Holy Father, will our

voices rise at the opening of this assembly to thank your Holiness for your fatherly condescension to a persecuted clergy, and from the bottom of our hearts we thank you for having called us together to deliberate on questions which your sovereign authority alone has the right to decide.

The first act, then, of the meeting of the Bishops of France is an act of filial love which rises to your Holiness as a sure witness of our deepest gratitude.

This blessing of praying and taking common counsel together—is it not a compensation granted by Providence for the many trials that threaten us, and have indeed already begun to press in upon us? Isolation was hard in the tranquil days of peace; how bitter it would have been in days of persecution and struggle, and how sweet it is now for us to allow that cry of the Psalmist to break forth from our pastoral and brotherly hearts: “Behold how good and joyful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.”

We are about, then, Most Holy Father, to take counsel together according to your desire, and amid our fraternal discussions, and in the shock of the various opinions which will be put forth, we shall ever have our eyes turned towards the august and infallible guardian of truth. We shall give expression to our personal views, but only in sacrificing them in advance to the judgment of Peter, which will be for us a command from on high.

The order of our labors places in the very front the study of the Papal document—a true monument at once of divine and human wisdom which judges and condemns the Law of Separation.

Already, from every pulpit in the churches of France, has been read this solemn exposition which authoritatively brands it as impious and irrevocably condemns its alleged legal procedure; already the voice of the Bishops has made itself heard in every part of the country in a respectful accord of praise and thanks to hail, as was becoming, a teaching that was at once sound and sure.

But here we are the episcopate, speaking as a body, and our voices rise in absolute unanimity to proclaim the same sentiment with still greater force and with accumulated energy the respect and love which we individually profess for the Vicar of Jesus Christ, our beloved Pontiff and Father, Pius X.

Thanks be to you, Most Holy Father, for this utterance which, grave, solemn and powerful, has resounded over a domain which was not theirs; thanks be to your Holiness for having pointed out the errors, branded the unseemliness, condemned the injustice and suspended, to the point perhaps of prohibition, the carrying out of this pernicious law.

There are in the language of encyclicals certain more solemn

formulas and weighty words from which proceeds a sentence deliberately delivered or a condemnation carefully indicated, which stand as the resumé of the whole mind of the Pontiff who is their author.

These formulas have been long and carefully thought out; they have been subjected to the most rigorous examination and placed upon the altar of prayer before being published to Christian people as the calm and strong expression of truth and justice. And have not the severe words in one of the last pages of the Encyclical *Vehementer* this character? Do they not make us shudder—those sentences launched from so high a place and with such an accent of independence and conviction, in which it seems that the authority of man is merged and lost in that of God, who speaks in his place? And after the just severity of the condemnation come tender appeals that reveal at once the love of the father and the indulgence even of the judge, to be followed by counsels which trace the lines for exhortation and cheer us on to the struggle, to suffering and, if need be, to martyrdom.

We are the sons of the Christ who was sacrificed, successors of the Apostles, happy of being deemed worthy to suffer for Jesus Christ, brothers of the victims whose blood poured out so gloriously marks the bright pages of the history of the Church. We cannot repudiate this heritage of splendid and triumphant sacrifice. We must remain faithful to the end to such traditions of Christian pride, of untarnished and valiant honor, of strong, triumphant truth.

Such, in brief, is the document so impatiently awaited by the world after the promulgation of the law. And the world has understood it, and has been struck with this statement of the truth that enlighteneth every man coming into this world, and has bowed down before this fresh testimony borne to everlasting truth.

This, Most Holy Father, is the book which we shall read and read again during these days of prayer and toil, and in it we shall find light to guide us and a source of strength to come to a decision.

It is told in the second book of Esdras that the people of God on their return from captivity, on re-entering Jerusalem and finding everything in ruins, everywhere sought the prophet that from his mouth they might hear the reading of the sacred text and the interpretation of the word of the Lord: "And they rose up to stand; and they read in the book of the law of the Lord their God four times in the day, and four times they confessed and adored the Lord their God."

Esdras mounts the raised platform which he has had erected that he might be heard, and all around him are the principal personages of the house of Israel. All the people are standing. When Esdras unrolls the volume of the Law, his first word is a cry of thanks-

giving to Almighty God, and the people answer with cries and sobs, lifting their hands, "Amen! Amen!" For the people wept, according to the testimony of the Sacred Book, on hearing read the Book of the Law: "For all the people wept when they heard the words of the law."

From this day forth it is public penance for a whole people returning from a harsh captivity. It acknowledges that it has deserved its misfortunes. No longer does it think of reproaching God with the severity of His justice. Its sole care henceforth will be to fulfill the law. Every father of a family signs his hand to this solemn pledge. All will henceforth work at the cost of many sacrifices to restore Jerusalem, its homes and its temples.

France, Most Holy Father, passed through this feverish waiting, this hope, these deep emotions and these resolutions of amendment when she was anxiously awaiting and when she heard with gladness the august word of your Holiness in the last encyclical.

With you, Holy Father, we condemn the false principles of the possible separation of Church and State; with you, under feelings of filial indignation, we suffer the unseemly and criminal audacity of a power which, burning to tear up a contract entered into with the Church, does it by itself, without any previous notice and without any communication of any sort with the Chief of the Church. With you and like you, we protest against the sacrilegious usurpation of ecclesiastical property, of churches and pious foundations; against the pretension of the civil power to regulate alone questions of the administration of church property and alone to lay down the conditions under which the organs of that administration must work.

To sum up all in a word, we blame whatever your Holiness blamed, we condemn whatever you condemned, and with eyes turned towards Rome, the mother and mistress of all Churches, we shall await in penitence and prayer the word of the future to be given to us by Peter, and then, as Catholic Bishops and Frenchmen, we shall know how to obey.

That, Holy Father, is our last word. It is also, in spite of all appearances to the contrary on the field of politics, the feeling and resolve of the great majority of our Catholic people, insufficiently enlightened as to the consequences of their votes in the election of members of Parliament. They allow themselves to be persuaded that politics and religion are two things absolutely distinct which should not be confounded; hence comes the tendency of the people to hold no account of religious interests in political matters; hence the deception of those who had seen in the election an immediate means of restoring to the Church the plenitude of her rights and liberties.

In spite of everything, however, the sentiment of faith remains inviolable at the bottom of the soul of France. Her title of eldest daughter of the Church has kept before the eyes of the people her prestige and splendor. The Roman Pontiff is heard by all French Catholics as the mouthpiece of Christ, whose Vicar he is. His word is for them sacred; his person more venerated and beloved by them than amongst any other nation, and their fidelity will not belie itself, whatever the sacrifices that may be imposed upon them, when the Bishops, united in filial submission to the Holy See, shall make known to them the practical decisions already announced in the encyclical, and for which it has pleased your Holiness to take counsel from our assemblies.

We have hopes, too, Holy Father, that your fatherly goodness will ever be able to distinguish between the people that love Christ and the Pope, His Vicar, and the hot-headed men who silence their faith for the satisfaction of their miserable ambitions. No, a thousand times no, these men are not France, and never will be; and the day when the French democracy shall be enlightened it will show itself united in the faith of its Christ and in the love of its Pope.

This is why we dare, Most Holy Father, to beg you to keep for our France all her rights as the advance guard of your sacred person, all the privileges of her protectorate of Catholic interests in the East; and also, as we remain in spite of all the great Catholic nation, that you will give us the legitimate joy of seeing replaced in your councils the Cardinals of whom death deprived us at the very moment when our trials fell most heavily.

We await, Most Holy Father, all your paternal goodness, and we cry out as Bishops beforehand, in the union of our hearts—"Long live Christ, long live His beloved Vicar, the sweet, strong, great and generous Pope Pius X.!"

Book Reviews

GREAT CATHOLIC LAYMEN. By *John J. Horgan*. "Is example nothing? It is everything. Example is the school of mankind, and they will learn at no other." 12mo., pp. 388. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

Father Sheehan's introduction to this book is such an admirable essay on "Catholic Biographies," that we are glad to reprint it as a whole by way of review. We intended to quote from it, but a second reading caused us to change our purpose:

"The only reason I can advance for prefixing this introduction to a book which will speak eloquently for itself is that I believe that it was I who had the good fortune of inspiring the writer with the idea of the necessity in our age of some such handbook of Catholic biography as this proves to be. For the need, though perfectly apparent, never seems to have attracted Catholic writers; or if it did, they must have assured themselves that the time was not ripe for such a publication, or that Catholic sense and intelligence were not ripe enough to demand it. And yet who has not felt the want of some such compilation as that now presented to the public? The great writers, thinkers and workers of other religions have been glorified by studies, memoirs, biographies or reminiscences without number. Their reliques, letters—everything appertaining to them—have been published, and read eagerly by a public who delight in probing into the secrets of its heroes. Their works have been issued in every kind of novel edition, their portraits reproduced in etching, engraving and photograph. Their habits of life, their studies, their books have been eagerly searched for indisputable signs of a genius already acknowledged. For the narrower reading circles of the public, *analecta* have been culled and sifted and selected; and young authors and aspiring workers have been bidden to go to these masters to study their lives for the formation of character or intellect, and their books, their habits, etc., to learn therefrom how to take the initial steps towards the success that crowned their life efforts.

"I cannot recall the name of one great pagan, or Protestant, who has been neglected. But what of your Catholic writers and workers? You seek their names in vain in encyclopædia or dictionary of biography. The world has deemed them unworthy of notice; and we have accepted the verdict. Hence you will not find in the many volumes that are now published under the title 'Great Statesmen' a notice, much less a life, of Windthorst or O'Connell; or if these distinguished men are mentioned, it is to be dismissed in a few brief,

almost contemptuous sentences. In a series of philosophical classics what place is there for an Aquinas or a Suarez? You have Kant, and Hegel, and Fichte, and Schelling, Hume and Berkeley, Bacon and Hobbes, Comte and Cousin; but where are Augustine, and St. Thomas, and Bellarmine, and Vasquez? Where Maistre or Montalembert? Where Brownson and Newman? In a cheap reprint of the poets you will find every name but Coventry Patmore and Aubrey de Vere. And if you were to seek details of these men's lives, and few who have read their works could fail to be interested in them, where are you to find them?

"It will be said at once that hitherto Catholics, at least in these countries through the lack of university training, and, therefore, through the absence of that fine sense of appreciation for whatever is valuable or attractive in the personalities of their great co-religionists, have been conspicuously indifferent about the lives or thoughts or works of those who, clinging fast to the tenets of their faith, have wrought great deeds either through the emancipation of oppressed creeds or nationalities, or through discoveries in science made in the seclusion of their studies. And from this indifference there sprang a natural yet quite erroneous inference, that outside the domain of theology and philosophy, the Catholic Church had little to show in the industry or intelligence of her children. Apparently Catholic thinkers contributed but little towards the progressive tendencies of modern times. In art alone they seemed to have held their position. In science, in industrial improvements, in commercial advancement, in literature, embracing the different departments of history, poetry, the drama, etc., they seemed to have held no place. And as a result that word 'reactionary' has been applied to the Church itself, and the world and many Catholics who follow the world's direction and obey its behests, have labored themselves into the conviction that religion and progress are inconsistent, that dogma and science are incompatible, that there can be no truce, much less a treaty, between the ever progressive, ever advancing spirit of the modern world and the granite immobility of Catholicism. It is quite possible that some such idea underlies the persistent refusal of English statesmen to grant a university to Catholic students; and the same idea occupies the minds of many Catholics who know but little of the fundamental beliefs of the faith they profess and still less of the vast output of energy in every department of political and social science, of arts and letters, that has emanated from the genius and labors of Catholic scientists, politicians and statesmen during that period of three hundred years which marks the rise and development of all that passes under the name of modern progress and enlightenment.

"How far this misconception of the spirit and mission of the Catholic Church and this ignorance of the leading part taken by Catholics in all that subserves modern advancement may be traced to our own indolence is a debatable question. Perhaps it is the eternal question of supply and demand again. There certainly was no articulate demand for Catholic biography heretofore, and there certainly was no supply. Hence, it cannot be said that these papers, now presented in book form to the public, under the auspices of the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, are inopportune. They meet a great want, if they do not supply a great demand. They may be considered in the light of a handy reference volume for the large and increasing section who, we hope, are beginning to understand the fertility of the Church in creating scholars as well as saints. And, lest we should suppose that imagination would run riot in such panegyrics as are here offered, the author judiciously introduces extracts from the writings and correspondence of his subjects that prove every thesis of belief and action as it is advanced.

"It is quite true that this compilation does not aim at being a complete dictionary of Catholic biography. Many names will suggest themselves to every reader which, perhaps, would have an equal right for consideration with those that are here introduced. But it was necessary that there should be a selection, and the selection is a judicious one. The author has sought for 'representative men' amongst Catholics, as Emerson sought them in the large category of great men, or as Carlyle sought them for his lectures on heroes. And he has given us as patriots and statesmen Hofer, Windthorst and O'Connell; as ruler, Moreno; as journalist, Frederick Lucas; as historian and *litterateur*, Montalembert; as philanthropist, Ozanam; as scientist, Pasteur. It is a well selected and comprehensive list taken from different nationalities, and more or less different periods of time. And the author through these biographies has made evident the thesis underlying them, namely, that the Catholic Church and patriotism, the Catholic Church and politics, the Catholic Church and science, nay, even the Catholic Church and the most significant feature of the modern world—journalism—are by no means in antagonism, but that around every step and every effort of the modern world towards that millennium which, if it is but 'as the dream of them that awaken from sleep,' is yet a vision of inspiration forever beckoning forward the struggling masses of humanity, the Catholic Church casts its own illumination, all the brighter because, when the lesser lights of human knowledge are extinguished, it alone is destined to expand and continue forever.

"Outside and beyond this great lesson, which the following pages so eloquently teach, there is another, an extrinsic one, which the pub-

lication of such biographies happily suggests. This is a book written by a young Catholic layman about Catholic laymen. The smell of incense, the odor of the sanctuary does not hang about it—only that atmosphere of living faith which is common to chancel, and nave, and aisle, and which may be breathed freely by that large section that forms an integral portion of the living Church—the *Ecclesia discens*. It is a novelty, but an agreeable one. It is a new departure, but a happy one. If we might argue from it that a new spirit has been breathed into our young Catholics; that, at last, they had begun to realize their responsibilities, and to assume the duties of zeal and charity, and earnestness which these responsibilities impose, it would impress that Church which has been yearning for the help of such allies with a fresh sense of vigor and elasticity in its onerous mission to the world.

“Educationists are now teaching that one of the most serious defects in our system of teaching is the neglect of manual instruction, especially the neglect of teaching children that they have a left hand as well as a right. Might we say that one of our mistakes hitherto has been that the Church has been one-handed in its mighty struggle against the world, and that the enormous power of an educated and faithful laity has never been realized?

“These lectures have their own lesson in that matter. What Moreno did in South America, Montalembert and Pasteur in France, Windthorst in Germany, Hofer in the Tyrol, O’Connell and Lucas in Ireland, can still be done. But they must be discovered and put in their proper grooves and encouraged by all the maternal affection and solicitude of the Church to labor in the great cause of the uplifting and regeneration of humanity.

“And these papers have this further lesson. That if a young Catholic layman burthened by professional duties and distracted by many other calls upon his time has been able to study the details and master the many facts that are embodied in these biographies, it is only reasonable to argue that many more might do the same, or similar work, in other departments, and help the common cause by zealous and judicious coöperation. If we might be privileged to hope this, would it not mean the dawning of a new era, and would not the historian of the future looking back upon the achievements of such devoted Catholics exclaim with Ozanam when he first beheld the sea, ‘The floods have lifted up, O Lord! the floods have lifted up their voice. The floods have lifted up their waves with the voice of many waters.’ (Ps. xcii., 3.)

“One brief further suggestion. Is it too much to expect that some young ecclesiastical students—better still some young priests—may be encouraged to accomplish a similar work for our great philoso-

phers and theologians? We have 'Blackwood's Philosophical Classics,' 'Great Statesmen,' 'Great Writers,' in one series after another, and the reading world seems never to tire of them. When shall we have 'Catholic Philosophical Classics,' 'Catholic Theologians,' etc.? There are few amongst the clergy who would not like to know something about De Lugo, Suarez, Franzelin, a Lapide, names consecrated to us because of their association with our college days. We have long lives of St. Thomas and St. Augustine, but we want brief, pithy biographies, such as are given of thinkers and workers of the outer world. Their writings would help us if we knew a little more of their lives."

ESSAYS IN PASTORAL MEDICINE. By *Austin O'Malley, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D.*, Pathologist and Orthalmologist to St. Agnes' Hospital, Philadelphia, and *James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D.*, Adjunct Professor of Medicine at the New York Polyclinic School for Graduates in Medicine; Professor of Nervous Diseases and of the History of Medicine, Fordham University, New York. 8vo., pp. 363. Longmans, Green & Co., 91 and 93 Fifth avenue, New York, Bombay and London.

The preface to this book is worthy of reproduction in its entirety, and it explains the need and purpose and plan of the work better than we could do it:

"The term Pastoral Medicine is somewhat difficult to define because it comprises unrelated material ranging from disinfection to foeticide. It presents that part of medicine which is of import to a pastor in his cure and those divisions of ethics and moral theology which concern a physician in his practice. It sets forth facts and principles whereby a physician himself or his pastor may direct the operator's conscience whenever medicine takes on a moral quality, and also explains to the pastor, who must often minister to a mind diseased, certain medical truths which will soften harsh judgments and other facts which may be indifferent morally, but which assist him in the proper conduct of his work, especially as an educator. Pastoral medicine is not to be confused with the code of rules commonly called medical ethics.

"The material of pastoral medicine requires constantly renewed discussion, because medicine in general is progressive enough frequently to devise better methods of diagnosis and treatment, and thus the postulates of the moral questions involved are changed. The discussion, however, is not easily made. The facts upon which the ethical part of pastoral medicine rests are furnished by the physician for the consideration and judgment of the moralist—the physician educated after modern methods knows little or nothing of ethics and cannot himself make accurate moral decisions. The moralist,

on the other hand, is commonly a poor counsellor to the physician, because long training in medicine is needed before the physical data of the moral decision is comprehended. The physician, therefore, is at a loss to determine what he may or may not do in cases that involve the greatest moral responsibility, and the priest is a hesitating guide because the moral theologies do not convincingly present the doctrine in the case.

"Now and then such subjects have been proposed for discussion to a group of physicians and moralists, but usually no practical conclusion has been reached because one side did not understand the other. In 1898 there was a series of articles on ectopic gestation in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, in which moralists like Lehmkühl, Sabetti, Aertnys and Holaind and some of the leading gynæcologists of America considered the questions, but arrived at no decision. The physicians did not understand certain questions, other questions were on obsolete medical practice, essential questions were omitted, and from the data the moralists came to opposed conclusions.

"We find also in moral theologies deductions drawn from false medical sources. Reasons are given, for example, to justify the use of a large quantity of alcoholic liquor at a dose in a case of great pain, typhoid fever, snake poisoning and other diseases, in the supposition that such doses will benefit or cure the patient, whereas the physician that would follow that treatment would be guilty of malpractice. There was recently in America a discussion on the relation of oöphorectomy to the *impedimentum impotentiae*. One side held that the lack of ovaries constitutes impotence; the other side that it does not. The discussion was useful because it incidentally gathered the full doctrine of the moralists on this subject, but from the medical point of view there is no connection whatever between these conditions.

"A small number of books on pastoral medicine have been written by clergymen that were not physicians, and a few German books by physicians that were also moralists. Those by the physicians draw conclusions from antiquated medical practice, or they are mere popular treatises of hygiene; those by the clergymen have some value on the ethical side, but they are incomplete because the authors had not the necessary medical knowledge. The essays offered in this book by no means cover the entire field of pastoral medicine, but as far as they go we have endeavored to offer the medical doctrine of the present day on the questions considered, and that as completely as is necessary to draw the moral inferences.

"Since, then, so many of the questions of pastoral medicine are not defined, physicians are likely to follow the doctrine of the stand-

ard medical books, which without exception advise them to take the life of a dangerous foetus almost as unconcernedly as they might prescribe an active drug, or in any case to put utility before justice. There is, therefore, an urgent necessity that competent men fix that shifting part of ethics and moral theology called pastoral medicine, and these essays are presented as a temporary bridge to serve in crossing a corner of the bog until better engineers lay down a permanent causeway.

"Some may think that the authors are inclined toward an exaggerated charity in suggesting the measure of responsibility for many human actions, but the physician that is brought much into contact with those suffering from mental defects of various kinds soon learns how easily complete responsibility becomes marred. Responsibility is dependent entirely upon free will; and while the great principle of free will remains solid in truth, no two men are free in exactly the same manner. Physical conditions have not a little to do with the modifications of freedom of the will. To point out this fact to the clergyman and the physician has been our intention, for a proper appreciation of it will widen the bounds of charity and save many that are more sinned against than sinning from the injury of grievous misjudgment. It is better to run the risk of exculpating a few individuals whose responsibility is not entirely clear when the application of the same principles lifts many others above the rash judgment of those who can be of most help to them."

Apart from the information contained in this preface, it is useful as a specimen of the ability of the authors to think correctly and express themselves clearly. Both are able men, and their ability has been proved. Dr. Walsh needs no introduction to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*, for they have on more than one occasion been entertained and instructed by him.

The chapters of the book have the following headings: "Eotopic Gestation," "Pelvic Tumors in Pregnancy," "Abortion, Miscarriage and Premature Labor," "The Cæsarean Section and Craniotomy," "Maternal Impressions," "Human Terata and the Sacraments," "Social Medicine," "Some Aspects of Intoxication," "Heredity, Physical Disease and Moral Weakness," "Typhnism, Suggestion and Crime," "Unexpected Death," "Unexpected Death in Special Diseases," "The Moment of Death," "The Priest in Infectious Diseases," "Infectious Diseases in Schools," "School Hygiene," "Mental Diseases and Spiritual Direction," "Neurasthenia," "Hysteria," "Menstrual Diseases," "Chronic Disease and Responsibility," "Epilepsy and Responsibility," "Psychic Epilepsy and Secondary Personality," "Impulse and Responsibility," "Criminology and the Habitual Criminal," "Paranoia: A Study in Cranks," "Suicides," "Venereal Diseases and Marriage,"

"Social Diseases," "De Impedimento Matrimonii Dirimente Impotentia," "Bloody Sweat."

FREE WILL, and Four English Philosophers (Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Mill). By the *Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* "The belief in freedom is at the root of our entire conception of personality."—Mallock, "Reconstruction of Belief." 12mo., pp. 234. Burns & Oates, 28 Orchard street, London, W. Benziger Brothers, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati.

Father Rickaby's introductory remarks are so very characteristic, and at the same time serve as a specimen of his style, while explaining his purpose and plan, that we subjoin them without comment:

"In their original form these pages were written in the years 1871-4. Since then they have been submitted to much castigation and amendment, less perhaps than they deserve, at the hands of the writer, then youthful, now an elderly man. This fact may account for some inequalities of style. Certain 'tender memories of the past' have stayed my hand from pruning away all traces of the exuberance of youth.

"Meanwhile, the importance of the subject has grown rather than diminished, chiefly, I think, owing to the prevalence of the Kantian philosophy. I may as well forewarn the reader that Kant is not discussed here, except indirectly, in so far the phenomenalism of Hume may be considered to have prepared the way of Kant. I have written elsewhere: 'Though men are slow to see it and are loth to own it, from reminiscences I think of the *odium theologicum* hanging about the question, free will still remains the hub and centre of philosophical speculation. In this work the subject is treated entirely on philosophical grounds; that is to say, there is no reference to grace, predestination or the Fall. Thus St. Augustine stands out of the controversy; so, too, Calvin and Jansenius. My method is to quote a passage from the English philosopher under examination, and then discuss it. The method has its drawbacks, but it ensures definiteness and seems about as fair to the philosopher discussed as any other form of procedure. It is not the writer's fault if the reader has not his Hobbes, or his Locke, or his Hume by his side, and does not read round and study in the context the extract presented to him.

"The *fact* that man has free will is far more certain—it is a point of Catholic faith—than any explanation *how* he has it. As to how free will works, the Church has given no explanation; there is much divergence even of the orthodox opinion, and, wherever my reading has traveled, considerable obscurity. The fact is usually proved by the indirect method of enlarging upon the consequences of a denial of free will. That method I too have frequently employed. But

further, I offer some positive view of the precise working of free will. I have not borrowed it from Locke. The view I take is briefly this: To will at all, our will must be struck by a motive, which raises in us what I have called a 'spontaneous complacency.' As the four philosophers under review all agree, and I agree with them, this complacency is a fact of physical sequence, a necessity, under the circumstances. But it is not yet a volition. It does not become a volition until it is hugged, embraced, enhanced, under advertence, by the conscious self. This process takes time—I do not mean so many seconds measured by the watch, for thought time goes on other wheels than motion time—but still it takes time. Free will turns upon the absence of any need of your making up your mind at once to accept the particular complacency thus present in your soul; observe, you cannot here and now accept any other; you cannot here and now accept what is not here and now offered; you cannot just at present fling yourself upon the absent. Thus time is gained for rival motives to come up, according to the ordinary laws of association, perception or personal intercourse; each of these motives excites its own necessary complacency, till at last some present complacency is accepted and endorsed by the person, and that is an act of free will. Not to have a *regressus in infinitum*, we must further observe that no volition is requisite simply to hesitate, delay and withhold your acceptance of any present complacency—in fact, to remain undecided and irresolute. You may, of course, put forth a positive volition to wait and see more of the question; all I say is that such a positive volition is not indispensable; your will may hang fire without your resolving to be irresolute; which important point Locke never came clearly to remark.

"This explanation may not account for free will in God and in His holy angels; but in so difficult a matter it is much if we can form some theory which the philosopher may debate, and a sound theologian will not bar as heretical, 'erroneous' or 'temerarious.' I may add that while I am much concerned that my reader should not be a determinist, I am comparatively indifferent whether he accepts my explanation of free will, or any other, or regards the process as inexplicable."

A LIVING WAGE: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects. By John A. Ryan, S. T. L., Professor of Ethics and Economics in the St. Paul Seminary. With an introduction by Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D. 12mo., pp. 346. Macmillan Company, New York.

As the question of the relations between capital and labor are pressing harder each day, everything new on the subject is worthy

of serious attention. We shall never have peace between these two classes, so closely related and yet so far apart, until the question of a fair wage is finally settled. The term "a living wage" is misleading, because there are different standards of living. It is a mistake to say, as so many employers do, that they are justified in paying as low a rate of wages as men will work for. It would be nearer the truth to say that they are bound to pay them the highest rate of wages commensurate with a just compensation for their own services and a reasonable return on the capital invested. Moreover, they are bound to treat them as fellow-men and not as cattle. In other words, they must do more than pay them wages. They must take a personal interest in them and their families, in sickness and in health, in joy and in sorrow, at work and at play. All this is required on ethical grounds, and until it is done, it seems vain to hope that employers will treat employes fairly in the matter of compensation for labor. The employer may not do it directly; he may employ agents, but the balance will never be struck in any other way. Law cannot enter into the settlement of all the minute questions that arise in the transaction of any large business where the varying capacities of men and the constantly changing values of materials and products have to be taken into consideration. Unless the man in control desires to be just and tries to be just, according to the law of God, even when the law of man cannot reach him, we shall never be able to regulate capital and labor, for the court of last resort will be the court of might—not right.

Father Ryan's book is especially interesting because it deals with the ethical aspect of the wage question as well as with the economic aspect. It seems clear to us that there is no other reasonable way of dealing with it. The author understands his subject and he develops it well. His statements are direct, his reasoning logical, his language clear and his conclusions inevitable. This short quotation will serve as an example:

"This work does not profess to present a *complete* theory of justice concerning wages. It lays down no minute rules to determine the full measure of compensation that any class of laborers ought to receive. The principles of ethics have not yet been applied to the condition of modern industry with sufficient intelligence, or confidence, or thoroughness, to provide a safe basis for such an undertaking. The conclusion to which it would lead would either be too general to be of any practical value or too uncertain to yield more than a misleading approximation to ethical truth. At any rate, the doctrine advanced would probably fail to convince any considerable section of those to whom it was addressed. The great majority of fair-minded persons believe, indeed, that labor does not get its full

share of the wealth which it helps to create, but they are not agreed as to the precise measure of that ideal share.

"Upon one principle of partial justice unprejudiced men are, however, in substantial agreement. They hold that wages should be sufficiently high to enable the laborer to live in a manner consistent with the dignity of a human being. To defend this general conviction by setting forth the basis of industrial, religious and moral fact upon which it rests is the aim of the present volume. Several considerations have led the author to think that this task is well worth while. In the first place, the living wage doctrine points the way to a very considerable amelioration of the condition of millions of American workingmen; in the second place, a living wage would enable those raised to its level to improve their position still further; and, in the third place, this volume shows that religion as represented by the oldest and largest of Christian denominations progresses, nay, urges, a definite and considerable measure of industrial justice.

"While insisting that every laborer has a right to at least a living wage, the author does not commit himself to the view that this quantity of remuneration is full and adequate justice in the case of any class of laborers. His concern is solely with the ethical minimum."

ECCLESIA: The Church of Christ. A planned series of papers by Dom. Gilbert Dolan, O. S. B., Father Benedict Zimmerman, O. D. C., Father R. H. Benson, M. A., Dom. John Chapman, O. S. B., Dom. J. D. Breen, O. S. B., A. H. Mathew and Father Peter Finlay, S. J. Edited by Arnold Harris Mathew. 12mo., pp. 182. Burns & Oates, 28 Orchard street, London, W. Benziger Brothers, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati.

This book deals with a very important question. We do not dwell enough on the teaching authority of the Church, in existence before the New Testament. Its excellence is indicated by these words of the editor:

"In arranging this volume my desire has been to provide a concise and simple explanation of what Catholics understand by 'the Notes' of the Christian Church. To the Reverend Fathers who have kindly contributed articles, written independently one of the other, I desire to express my thanks.

"The reader will do well to bear in mind that our Lord founded His visible Church and that it had become recognized, widespread and numerically powerful before any portion of the New Testament was written. The divine religion, inaugurated and provided with various marks and prerogatives by Christ, had no need of any books as sources of knowledge or doctrine, since it was endowed with the fullest deposit of revelation by our Lord from the beginning, together with the safeguards divinely appointed for the preservation and the transmission of that revelation to the human race for all time.

"The earliest of the Gospels was not written until thirty or more years had elapsed after the Ascension. The Primitive Church was, consequently, without sacred books. Instead of deriving her teaching from the sacred writings, the Church began her mission before they existed, and consequently the authors of the New Testament Scriptures derived much of their knowledge of the teaching and life of our Lord from the Church. The Holy Scriptures, instead of being the source or rule of faith, are, to Catholics at any rate, a record of the teaching of the Church in the first ages; a record confirmatory and corroborative of the faith, but one which was never intended to supplant the divine authority of the living voice of the Church.

"Nothing is more clearly indicated throughout the New Testament than the divine and indefectible character of the visible *Ecclesia* instituted by Christ and designed by Him to be the ark of salvation for and the oracle of His revelation to mankind.

"Whereas Protestantism, in all its varying forms, professes to be based upon Scripture, and to be absolutely dependent upon it, Catholicism proclaims the eternal infallibility of the Church, independently of any book, by virtue of the abiding presence within her of the Spirit of Truth, her voice being, in all authoritative utterances, the voice of her Divine Author Himself. Before the New Testament existed, before its inspired books were collected together, before they were translated from the languages in which they were originally written, long before copies of the New Testament had been multiplied by the laborious process of transcription, ages before the invention of the art of printing, the Catholic Church was here, preaching the glad tidings of the Gospel, offering up the adorable sacrifice of the New Law 'in every place,' administering the sacraments and making disciples of all nations. What she did in her earliest days she has ever since continued to do in the same way, and she will not have completed her task until the end of all things is reached. Sects may come and sects may go, but the Church is eternal because she is divine, and consequently one and invisible, holy, Catholic both in time and extent, apostolic and Petrine—that is papal. Not only does the Church instituted by Christ possess all these distinguishing marks or notes, but so conspicuous are they that she can be recognized at a glance as the only institution upon earth possessing these visible indications of her divine origin and character.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. Horace K. Mann. Vol. III., 858-891. B. Herder, St. Louis. Price, net, \$3.00.

The period dealt with in the present volume of Father Mann's valuable history of the Popes extends through six Pontificates, viz.,

those of St. Nicholas I., Hadrian II., John VIII., Marinus I., Hadrian III. and Stephen (V.) VI. The dominating personage of the era was undoubtedly the great St. Nicholas I., who imprinted his strong character upon his times and became the founder of the mediæval Papacy, the claims of which he formulated and asserted with all possible clearness and precision. Though he reigned only nine years (858-867), the story of his Pontificate occupies more than one-third of the entire volume. His importance in the history of the Papacy amply justifies all the space allotted to him by the learned author. Such weighty topics as the Photian schism, the divorce of Lothaire, the curbing of arbitrary metropolitan power, the conversion of the Bulgarians, the missionary efforts in the distant North could not be dealt with summarily. The remaining five Pontificates are treated with a like view to their respective importance. The source, nature and scope of the False Decretals receive due attention. The appearance on the scene of Anastasius Bibliothecarius gives the author an opportunity of discoursing on the formation of the Papal library.

We await with mournful interest the next volume of Father Mann's history, dealing with the saddest epoch in the long annals of the Papacy.

PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. By the *Very Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O. S. B.*, author of "Lectures for Boys," "Life of Gregory Lopez, the Hermit," etc. Third edition. 8vo., pp. 578. R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1, 2 and 4 Paternoster Row. London. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

"The chief object for which this work has been written is to furnish those who wish to lead a solidly devout life in the ecclesiastical, in the religious or in the secular state with a manual or textbook containing in as compendious a form as possible the 'principles' upon which such a life must be built.

"The sources whence materials for an undertaking of this kind may be drawn are various and numerous; but out of the many at my disposal, two are especially deserving of mention, inasmuch as it has been by the doctrine which I have learnt from them that I have been guided in much that has been treated of in this book. The first of these are the works of Cassian, to which, as a child of St. Benedict, I felt myself drawn as it were by instinct; for it was from the world-famed conferences of this learned ascetic that our Holy Father drew much of that spiritual lore which is so conspicuous in the various enactments of his rule, and to the pages of which he refers his children for those sublime lessons of spiritual wisdom which will lead them to the topmost height of 'Christian perfection.' Cassian's teaching,

save upon the question of divine grace, is unexceptionally good. His deficiency upon this point may be satisfactorily accounted for if we bear in mind that in his day various questions which arise out of this most intricate subject had not been thoroughly examined into and set at rest forever by the infallible decision of the Church. The second is the *'Theologia Mystica'* of Father Dominick Schram, O. S. B., in which that erudite religious has bequeathed to us valuable treasures of Christian asceticism arranged with scientific accuracy and stored away with scholastic neatness and precision.

"The plan of which I have made use for reducing to order the mass of material which presented itself to my hands is a very simple one. It may be stated thus: In the life of every man there is an ultimate end, which is God. But in order to reach that ultimate end man must comply with certain conditions which have been laid down by God for the attainment of so magnificent a destiny. Therefore, besides his ultimate end, man has also a subordinate end or object in life. This is to win for himself that measure of perfection which is compatible with his state here below. Perfection, however, is made up of three elements—of charity, of purity of heart and of humility, all which must be made so to enter the very fibres of his being as to become part and parcel of himself. To obtain this subordinate end there are various means at man's disposal, chief among which are prayer, divine grace, docility to the movements and inspirations of the Holy Spirit, imitation of Christ and mortification, both internal and external.

"Upon each of these subjects, and upon the various ramifications into which some of them logically lead, ample instructions have been given. These will, perhaps, prove useful to those who are endeavoring to lead devout lives in the world. For those who wish to enter the ecclesiastical state there are chapters devoted to the treatment of subjects which are special to their sacred calling. Finally, for those who, in order to obtain perfection, make their self-renunciation perpetual by means of vows in the religious state, several chapters have been set aside for the explanation of those holy bonds by which they are more closely united to God.

"Also, an appendix has been added, in which each chapter has been carefully analyzed. These outlines or sketches of the matter which the reader shall have already pursued will, it is hoped, enable him to obtain a firmer grasp of it; they will help him to imprint it more deeply upon his mind; and if he should happen to be sealed with the priestly character and entrusted with the cure of souls, they will furnish him with plans by the aid of which he will be able to use the doctrine contained in this volume for the spiritual training of those committed to his charge."

CATHOLIC CHURCHMEN IN SCIENCE. Sketches of the lives of Catholic ecclesiastics who were among the great founders in science. By *James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D.*, Professor of Medical History, Fordham University Medical School, and Professor of Physiological Psychology in St. Francis Xavier's College, New York. 16mo., pp. 221, with portraits. The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia.

A few years ago the title of this book would have excited a sneer, but now it only causes mild surprise, and even that is not universal. Fortunately we have been giving more attention to our family history, and we have been bringing it to the attention of others. In recent years reading and thinking men have begun to understand that there is no conflict between science and religion, and cannot be. Cardinal Wiseman's great work on "Science and Revealed Religion" paved the way for similar books which followed. We have had several on Catholic scientists which by inference prove the same truth.

Dr. Walsh presents a new group to us, and their names will probably sound strange to most general readers, because they have been known to students principally.

After a chapter on "The Supposed Opposition of Science and Religion," the Doctor writes of "Copernicus and His Times," "Basil Valentine, Founder of Modern Chemistry," "Linacre: Scholar, Physician, Priest," "Father Kircher, S. J.: Scientist, Orientalist and Collector," "Bishop Stensen: Anatomist and Father of Geology," "Abbé Haney: Father of Crystallography," "Abbot Mendel: A New Outlook in Heredity." This is a remarkable group, nor is it by any means exhaustive. It contains names not sought out by the Doctor for the purpose of this book, but met with in the course of his work along other lines.

We cannot close without saying a word about the beautiful manner in which the book is made. It is a work of art, worthy of the subject, the author and the publisher. The author thus speaks of the book:

"The following sketches of the lives of clergymen who were great scientists have appeared at various times during the past five years in Catholic magazines. They were written because the materials for them had gradually accumulated during the preparation of various courses of lectures, and it seemed advisable to put them in order in such a way that they might be helpful to others working along similar lines. They all range themselves naturally around the central idea that the submission of the human reason to Christian belief, and of the mind and heart to the authority of the Church, is quite compatible with original thinking of the highest order, and with that absolute freedom of investigation into physical science which has only too often been said to be quite impossible to churchmen. For this reason friends have suggested that they should be published together in a form in which they could be more easy of

consultation than when scattered in different periodicals. It was argued, too, that they thus also would be more effective for the cause which they upheld. This friendly suggestion has been yielded to, whether justifiably or not, the reader must decide for himself. There is so great a flood of books, good, bad and indifferent, ascribing their existence to the advice of well-meaning friends that we poor authors are evidently not in a position to judge for ourselves of the merit of our works or of the possible interest they may arouse.

"I have to thank the editors of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, of the *Ave Maria*, of the *Ecclesiastical Review* and the *Dolphin* for their kind permission to republish the articles which appeared originally in their pages. All of them, though substantially remaining the same, have been revised, modified in a number of particulars and added to very considerably in most cases."

COMPENDIUM OF THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS—PARS PRIMA. By *Berardus Bonjoannes*, A. D. 1560. Translated into English. Revised by Father Wilfrid Lescher, O. P. With introduction and an appendix explanatory of scholastic terms by RR. Carlo Falcini, Vicar General of the Diocese of Fiesole, Italy. 8vo., pp. 310. Thomas Baker, London. Benziger Brothers, New York.

The highest commendation which can be given to St. Thomas' great work is that after hundreds of years, notwithstanding the doctrinal development of the centuries, it still remains the standard. The great Leo only called attention anew to its unquestioned merits when he revived its study in the ecclesiastical institutions of the world. It is quite becoming that it should appear in an English dress at this time, when so many similar books are being brought out in the vernacular. It will stand at the head of them all, as the original has stood at the head of its companions and competitors in the Latin. An idea of its excellence may be gathered from this quotation of the translator:

"It has become customary in our times to depreciate the philosophy of Aristotle, which had served during so many generations as an adequate vehicle of thought for philosophers and theologians of every school. This universal mind language of the civilized world was virtually discarded and lost among other things that fixed standard of expression without which mutual understanding is impossible—a loss to which may be at least partially attributed the amazing misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine which confront the reader in almost every non-Catholic work of the day (and in some also which ought to be Catholic), when they treat of religion, either directly or indirectly.

"Of the so-called Scholastic Philosophy a contemporary writer

says it was 'professedly the philosophy of common sense and common language which by reason of its child-like directness and simplicity departed as little as possible from the fundamental conceptions common to all philosophies,' adding that owing to its being likewise coherent, systematic and well worked out, the Aristotelian philosophy will perhaps always take precedence as indicated by the numerical Medicine," "Some Aspects of Intoxication," "Heredity, Physical Disease and Moral Weakness," "Hypnotism, Suggestion and Crime," "ber of revivals and reactions which have taken place in its favor.

"Whatever may be the deficiencies of this venerable philosophy, it may surely compare favorably with modern sectarian systems (almost as numerous as the religious sects with which they have been contemporaneous), and what a still more recent student of philosophy calls 'their muddled conclusions,' while its acceptance by the Church as the mind language best suited to the expression of religious dogma should induce seekers for truth to make themselves so far acquainted with it as to understand at least what the Christian Church really believes and teaches before rejecting it as inconsistent with modern science or their own spiritual needs.

"As it is chiefly to facilitate such an understanding that this work has been undertaken, it has been the translator's aim to render it into plain English, avoiding as far as possible technical words and expressions without attempting to modernize the more or less archaic simplicity of the original style."

THE GOLDEN DAYS OF THE RENAISSANCE IN ROME. From the Pontificate of Julius II. to that of Paul III. By *Rodolfo Lanciani*, author of "New Tales of Old Rome," "The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome," "Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries," etc. Copiously illustrated. Octavo, gilt top, pp. 340. Price, \$5.00, net. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Archibald Constable & Co., Ltd., London.

This is a beautiful book. Indeed, it is a triumph of the book-maker's art. It gives one the impression that the publishers spared nothing in the making, their one desire being to bring the book out in the most becoming form. They speak of it in this way:

"This new and valuable contribution to the history and archæology of Rome is a companion volume to the earlier works, 'The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome' and 'New Tales of Old Rome,' which have justly given Professor Lanciani the reputation of being the greatest authority on this subject. The purpose of the present volume is to describe the moral and material evolution of the Eternal City from mediæval conditions, and to draw a picture of it as it was at the very summit of its renaissance.

"The early chapters describe the city before the days of Pope Paul

III. Then follows an account of the wonderful change brought about under this Pope, and a study of the four personages who, above all others, fostered or perfected the reform movement, namely, Agostino Chigi in the financial development, Raphael and Michelangelo in the artistic, and Vittoria Colonna in the religious and moral. In dealing with the lives of these illustrious persons, facts or anecdotes already well known to the general public have not been repeated, but the author has confined himself to particulars either unpublished or little known. In developing the subject one principal aim has been kept in view—to illustrate the few monuments of that period left standing in Rome and mostly concealed under modern superstructures.

“The epoch described is perhaps the most interesting in the history of modern art, and consequently its appeal will be to a much wider audience than the other volumes in this series. The illustrations, about 100 in number, are many of them unique, the subjects having been drawn or photographed for the first time, so that both from a scholarly and an artistic point of view the book will prove a rare acquisition to the literature of Rome in particular and to archæology and art in general.”

Heavy calendared paper is used throughout, so that the very best effects are gotten in the pictures. The text is most attractively written and is entertaining and instructive. We shall not discuss its historical value.

JESUS OF NAZARETH. The Story of His Life Written for Children. By *Mother Mary Loyola*, of the Bar Convent, York. Edited by Father Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. 401. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

The author's excuse for undertaking the apparently impossible task of writing on a serious subject in a manner intelligible and interesting to children is found in the following sentence:

“The pressure of an earnest invitation sent me from America must be my excuse for venturing to add another Life of Christ for the Young to the excellent ones already existing. The aim proposed is to strengthen faith in our Lord's Divinity and to draw the hearts of children to Him by a personal love. To do this within the limits assigned it has seemed better to omit a certain amount of matter rather than sacrifice detailed descriptions of leading facts, which by impressing the imagination leave a vivid picture in the mind. Where different views as to chronology, etc., prevail, I have adopted the one supported by the greater number of Catholic authors.”

How far he has succeeded we may learn from these words of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons:

"My heart was delighted on reading the proof sheets of 'Jesus of Nazareth: The Story of His Life Written for Children,' by Mother Mary Loyola. The book is eminently practical, simple, unctuous and interesting. In fact, no one can read it without loving God more and, therefore, becoming better. The author evidently realizes the want of the child mind, and at the same time comforts every soul in its longing for something higher and better."

This is high commendation, and the author may well be proud of it. We are not vain enough to imagine that we can say anything to strengthen it, and we are tempted to think we might be accused of presumption if we attempted it.

CANZONI. By *T. A. Daly*. Pictures by John Sloan. Philadelphia: Catholic Standard and Times Publishing Company.

The talented manager of the *Catholic Standard and Times* is becoming recognized throughout the nation as a forceful exponent of genuine American wit and humor. His quaint sayings are quoted from one end of the country to the other. His success as a humorist may be largely attributed to the fact that, in addition to his being a true American, he is also a sunny child of Erin and a genuine Catholic. There seems to be no phase of life in America which has escaped his keen glance, and he notes down his impressions with one bold stroke of the pen. His study of the racial characteristics and peculiarities of speech of the Italian colony has been close and sympathetic. He deserves to be called the discoverer of the Italo-American. The little book has been universally greeted with well-merited encomiums.

SHORT SPIRITUAL READINGS FOR MARY'S CHILDREN. By *Madame Cecilia*, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham, London, S. W. 12mo., pp. 238. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Here is the history of the book as told by the author:

"This little volume contains reprints of articles which were originally published in the *Child of Mary Magazine*, edited by the Austin Canons at Spettisbury Priory, Blandford, Dorset. To these monthly articles I have added a few which have appeared in the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* and in the *Franciscan Monthly*. As many of our Children of Mary have expressed a desire to have these little articles in book form, I have ventured to collect and reprint them, in the hope that they may be useful to our dear Lady's children and to others into whose hands they may fall. With the exception of a few verbal changes required to bring them up to date, the articles

stand as they were originally published, and a few others have been written to complete the book."

And here is what the writer of the preface, Rev. Gilbert Higgins, C. R. L., says about it:

"Filled with affection for the Children of Mary and penetrated with a sincere desire to see them rise to their birthrights, Madame Cecilia lays down rules, gives counsels, suggests lines of conduct which all tend to inspire women with notions of becoming self-respect, lovable unselfishness and practical religion. The teachings of this book are varied. There is in it a lesson, a hint for every one. Examples and stories and apposite bits of verse are brought into the service of the author. The book if read carefully can hardly fail to lead many Children of Mary to become womanly women and true followers of their saintly and canonized predecessors, SS. Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecily and Anastasia."

THE LOVER OF SOULS. Short Conferences on the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By Rev. Henry Brinkmeyer. "Behold this Heart which hath so loved man!" 12mo., pp. 180. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

A collection of nineteen addresses, all devotional and dealing chiefly with the Sacred Heart and the Blessed Sacrament. The author says:

"Friends have often advised the publication of the following conferences. For a long time I hesitated to act upon this suggestion, as I cannot claim for them entire originality. They are bouquets of flowers gathered in years gone by from various gardens to suit my own taste and for the pleasure and comfort of those to whom they were presented. Perhaps their fragrance is sufficient to gratify and embalm other souls dear to the Sacred Heart. If so, may the Divine Master breathe through these blossoms the sweetness of love and the perfume of grace long after he who culled them has gone to rest from his humble labors."

THE GOSPELS OF THE SUNDAYS AND FESTIVALS. With an Introduction, Parallel Passages, Notes and Moral Reflections. By the *Very Rev. Cornelius J. Ryan, D. D.*, late Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin. 2 vols., 8vo. Vol. I., pp. 334; Vol. II., pp. 396. Second edition. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

Of sermon books there is no end. Like other things, they may be divided into three classes—good, bad and indifferent. Like other things, also, they are generally indifferent. For that reason we have generally given them scant courtesy, because we think that a man

should but rarely preach the good sermon of another, and a bad sermon never. We fear that the publishers have felt the ecclesiastical pulse before bringing out the many volumes of oratory which have recently appeared and that there is a demand for them. The conclusion is pretty reasonable that the poor laity are suffering the consequences.

It is with extreme pleasure, then, that we extend the pen of welcome to the book before us. It is well conceived, successfully brought forth and healthfully matured. It is a scholarly, dignified, lawful and useful book. It can be recommended without reservation to all preachers because, instead of destroying thought and study and preparation, it encourages them, and supplies the very best material to aid them. A glance at the plan of the author will reveal this.

"This explanation of the Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals was originally written for the use of a class of students in the College of the Holy Cross, Clonliffe, and it was intended as a full exposition of the passages of Sacred Scripture which are most frequently explained for the people. It is hoped that, supplied with the materials here collected, the ecclesiastical student or the missionary priest will be aided in his preparation for one of his most onerous but indispensable duties.

"In order to afford this assistance I have given (1) a brief introduction dealing with the gospels in general and with the scene of the gospel history; (2) the Greek and Latin of the Gospel extracts read at the Mass on the Sundays and principal Festivals throughout the year; (3) an English translation of each extract; (4) the parallel passage or passages when the subject is referred to by more than one evangelist; (5) a combined narrative in every case where there is a parallel passage; (6) a full explanation of each verse, together with an introductory note on the circumstances of time, place, etc., in which the event occurred or the discourse was delivered; and (7) moral reflections suggested by the matter already discussed in the notes. The Greek text is almost a verbatim reprint of the Vatican Codex B, as edited by Professor Ornsby, Dublin, 1864; the Latin text is taken from F. Vercellone's edition of the Vulgate New Testament, Rome, 1861; in the English translation I have almost constantly followed the edition of the Douay Bible published by Duffy, Dublin, 1888, with the approbation of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland; and in the moral reflections I have derived much help from Cardinal De La Luzerne's 'Explication des Evangiles.'

"To attain the end which I proposed to myself, I thought it necessary to study closely the early Fathers who have expounded the gospels either in whole or in part; the best Catholic commentators, both ancient and modern; the most esteemed Protestant writers, English and foreign; High Church, Low Church and Rationalistic; the best lexicographers, grammarians and authors of works on the antiquities of the Jews. I endeavored to avail myself of all the aid which was within reach, and to present my readers with the most recent information on the subject in hand. For the convenience of those who may wish to examine further any question here treated, I have inserted references to the authorities quoted, and have prefixed to this volume a list of the works consulted.

"It may be thought that, having in the Vulgate an approved version of the works of the evangelists, I have uselessly expended time in frequent references to the Greek text. To this it must be answered that in any exposition of the gospels which is worthy of the name, a frequent reference to the original text is not only useful, but necessary. It is well known that Greek is the most accurate and precise of all languages, and it follows that the thoughts of sacred writers expressed in that language cannot be fully rendered in the most faithful version. But it will be urged that the authenticity of the Vulgate has been declared in the most solemn manner by the Church in the Council of Trent. (Sess. 4, Decret. de editione et usu sacrorum librorum.) The Vulgate has, indeed, been declared authentic; and it follows not only that no false doctrine in faith and no erroneous rule in morals can be legitimately deduced from what is there contained, but also that this version faithfully gives all that appertains to the substance of the written word of God. Hence, for Catholics an appeal to the Vulgate settles, as a rule, questions regarding both the sacred text itself and its meaning; but this rule has many exceptions which are not affected by the declaration of the Council. Thus it appears safe to say that in the decree (1) the Fathers of Trent did not declare even by implication that the Vulgate is free from all errors in matters not affecting faith and morals; that (2) they did not even deny by implication that in the dogmatic passages themselves there is sometimes a certain difference between the Vulgate and the original texts, not only as to clearness or explicitness in expressing the dogma, but also as to the aspect in which the dogma is regarded; that (3) they did not give to dogmatic passages in the Vulgate hitherto doubtful a greater authority than these passages had already; and that (4) they neither asserted nor implied that the dogmatic passages originally in the autographs of the sacred writers are now to be found in the Vulgate. (See Cornely, *Introduct. in U. T. Libros Sacros*, Vol. I., pages 440-458.) If we keep in mind, then, the limited scope of the declaration regarding the authentic character of our Latin version we must admit that an appeal to the original text is in many cases necessary and in every case useful for those who wish to know fully the meaning intended by the evangelists."

GESCHICHTE DES VATIKANISCHEN KONZILS Von Seiner Ersten Ankündigung Bis zu Seiner Vertagung. Nach den authentischen Dokumenten dargestellt von *Theodor Grandérath, S. J.*, herausgegeben von *Konrad Kirch, S. J.* Dritter (Schluss-) Band: vom Schlusse der dritten "öffentlichen Sitzung bis zur Vertagung des Konzils. Die Aufnahme der Konzilsentscheidungen. (Die Päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit.) Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, net, \$4.20.

The third and concluding volume of the History of the Vatican Council takes up the story of the great council at the point when, at the demand of a large majority of the Fathers, the order of business was changed and the subject of Papal infallibility became the sole topic of discussion. The change was made imperative by the conduct of the opponents of the doctrine. It had been far from

the mind of Pius IX. and his advisers to formulate into a dogma a doctrine which was in quiet possession throughout the Church. Papal infallibility did not appear in any of the "schemata" submitted to the deliberation of the assembled Fathers. Very few Catholics, except downright Rationalists, took any other view of the question than that which every Catholic holds at the present day. But the bare possibility that the subject might come up at the Council so frightened those who were restive under the restraint of ecclesiastical authority that they precipitated a violent storm, which brought about that very definition which they dreaded. Whilst the Fathers of the Council were occupied in expounding the first principles of Christianity and in framing wise canons of discipline, the press throughout Europe was groaning under the weight of numberless articles and pamphlets containing virulent attacks upon the venerable Chair of St. Peter. Döllinger's "Janus," with its malignant travesty of history, supplied newspaper editors, whether "Liberal Catholic," Protestant or Jew, with abundant material for denouncing the Papacy, past and present. Neither Döllinger nor his admirers had any clear conception of the meaning of the "ultramontane" teaching, and it was but natural that, as the excitement grew, the issue should become even more and more befuddled. When a theologian like Newman was at a loss to understand the situation, we can pardon the Catholic laity if their attitude was one of sheer dismay. Looking back at this distance of time, we see that the affair was simply providential. A great deal of unsound opinion was latent in the minds of not a few, who had more or less unconsciously imbibed the poison of modern infidelity. The assembling of an infallible Council, the Supreme Court of the Catholic Church, brought matters to a definite issue and "revealed the thoughts of many." It is interesting to study the various effects of the storm upon the minds of the Fathers of the Council. Only a negligible number of the prelates had come to Rome with any personal doubts as to the infallibility of the Pope in questions of faith and morals. Some who had not made a deep study of theology began to waver under the violent attacks of the opponents; others, though uninfluenced themselves, were of opinion that until every objection ingeniously advanced had been thoroughly dissipated, a definition of the doctrine was premature; a still larger number deemed the definition inopportune from dread of the hostility of the secular power. The fears of the latter class of bishops seemed to be well founded, for the governments of the foremost Catholic nations, notably France and Bavaria, were making dire threats. It is amusing to notice that the statesman who was chiefly influential in preventing a coalition against the Council was none other than Bismarck, who could laugh in his sleeve at Napoleon III.'s fatal blunder at a crucial moment, in intermeddling in spiritual affairs. An overwhelming majority of the Bishops considered that the safety of the Church demanded prompt action on the part of the Council. They deemed it their sacred duty to decide once for all what had grown to be the burning question of the hour. The history of the past thirty-six years proves that they were right.

The labor of sifting and studying the immense mass of mate-

rials relating to the Council was so gigantic that we cannot wonder if it cost the lives of two great Jesuits, Fathers Schneemann and Granderath. The former succumbed to death just as he had prepared the Acts of the Council for the *Collectio Lacensis*. A similar fate overtook his assistant, Father Granderath, the author of the present history. The work of both of these laborers will endure to the end of time. This history will be recognized as one of the most classical and scientific ever written. It is as far superior as a work of art to Pallavicini as the twentieth century is to the seventeenth. It is candid, fearless and comprehensive. There is an utter absence of prejudice or bias, and no attempt is made to conceal or color facts. The vast array of materials is marshaled with an ability amounting to genius; there is not a dull page in the entire work. Particularly interesting is the full synopsis of the speeches during the debates, condensed from the stenographers' notes. An abler series of debates could not be found in any deliberative assembly in the world. The imputation made by the enemies of the Council of lack of freedom in the expression of opinions is shown to have been a gross calumny. On the contrary, we are forced to admire the extreme patience and courtesy of the majority party in listening over and over again to the same threshed-out arguments, repeated for the sake of killing time and preventing a decision. Altogether we consider this the most valuable book of the year and a great triumph of genuine Catholic historical criticism.

THE RELIGION OF THE PLAIN MAN. By *Father Hugh Benson*. 12mo., pp. 164. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

Father Benson's book is very interesting and very useful. He "constructs a dummy-figure with the brain of an average man, to endow him with sincerity, fearlessness and a hunger for God; to trace the workings of his mind when confronted with difficulties; to follow the fortunes of his spiritual quest, and to attempt to understand and interpret the reasons that effect his will."

The author leads this man, whom he calls John, from a belief in Christianity in general to an acceptance of the Bible as the rule of faith. He soon sees the necessity of an interpreter. He tries various sects with certain test questions, but finds them contradictory. He is introduced into the Anglican Church by a friend and finds rest there for a while; but in the end only unrest. Finally he makes his way into the only true Church and is at peace.

This is all done gradually and seems to be rather the story of the progress of a man of ordinary intelligence into the Church than a work of imagination. It ought to impress that class deeply, and it could be placed in their hands without comment.

Father Benson writes with an earnestness and vividness peculiar to educated converts, as may be seen in the opening passages of this book.

"I am perfectly aware that this book is open to an almost innumerable multitude of criticisms. It will be said, for example, that it is unscholarly and unlearned, because to deal with the subject of the Catholic Church and to omit the patristic literature and its con-

sideration, and instead take refuge in the Penny Catechism, is the sign of one who is afraid to face volumes. It will be said that it is rhetorical and inexact, emotional and unintellectual, contemptuous and uncharitable. I shall be told to hold my tongue if I have nothing better to do than to appeal to a man's weakness instead of his strength, to his imagination rather than to his reason. In fact, in so far as the book may be noticed at all by those who do not see with me in religious matters, I foresee quite a quantity of unpleasant remarks.

"A book itself is its only defense, and yet it seems worth while in this preface to emphasize what I shall hope to emphasize again and again in the following pages, and to say that in substance some of those criticisms will be perfectly true.

"The book is intended for the 'man in the street,' who, after all, has a certain claim on our consideration, since Jesus Christ came to save his soul. This man in the street, like myself, is entirely unable to discourse profoundly upon the Fathers, or to decide where the scholars disagree in matters of simple scholarship. His religion is composed partly of emotion, a good deal of Scripture, partly of imagination, and, to a very small extent, of reason. He is content to say what he thinks a text probably means, to recognize a few of the plainer facts of history, such as that Rome has always some sort of a Pope, and that ambition and wickedness may perhaps have characterized certain persons high in ecclesiastical affairs. He is capable also of understanding that oaks grow from acorns and athletes from babies; of perceiving a law or two in the development of life; he can grasp that poison has a tendency to kill, and that two mutually exclusive propositions require a good deal of proof before they can be accepted as different aspects of one truth.

"Now this kind of intellectual attainment seems a poor equipment for the pursuit of salvation, but it is undoubtedly the only equipment that many of us have, and it is God that has made us, not we ourselves. Therefore if we believe in God at all—at least in a God of mercy or even justice—we are bound to acknowledge that this equipment is all that we actually require. To tell me that because I cannot infallibly pronounce upon an obscure sentence of St. Cyprian's I am thereby debarred from making up my mind about the necessary truths of the Christian religion, is to represent my Maker as unjust and capricious. I am only capable of that of which I am capable.

"I have attempted, therefore, in these lectures, delivered more or less in the Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs at Cambridge, to deal with the question of the Christian religion from the standpoint which I have tried to indicate. I have quoted the Penny Catechism rather than St. Thomas Aquinas, because the one is more accessible to persons of moderate attainments. In this sense, though I sincerely hope in no others, it is an unscholarly and inexact book.

"As regards its rhetorical emotionalism, I can only say that a truth is not less of a truth if it is dressed in what may seem to some even a tawdry costume, and may perhaps be more attractive to certain eyes.

"As regards the possibility of 'contemptuous uncharitableness,' I am extremely sorry if I have given any cause for this accusation—I can only say that I have done my best to avoid it. But I have not attempted to avoid a poor sort of humor now and then, for I do not see why I need do so. There are funny people and funny things in this world; and we are more and not less Catholic if we acknowledge their existence. But I think that I do not anywhere attribute bad faith or insincerity of any kind to my opponents; and that, after all, is the only unpardonable device in controversy. Nor have I anywhere mocked at any doctrine which has any right to be held sacred by anybody. I have endeavored to show that some intellectual theories are absurdly impossible; but never that spiritual experience is anything but holy and reverent.

"Again, I have certainly appealed to man's weakness rather than his strength, for we have the best authority for believing that in this God's might is made manifest. As we may argue for the incarnation on the ground of man's crying need for it, so we may deduce that man's ignorance necessitates a heavenly teacher."

LECTURES ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By *Charles Coupe, S. J., M. A.* (London), sometime Professor of Philosophy, Stonyhurst College. Edited, with notes and references, by *Hatherkey More*. 12mo., pp. 248. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We welcome this book for several reasons. It is on the Blessed Eucharist and it appears at the time when the Holy Father's exhortation to frequent Communion makes a full and correct knowledge of the subject more than usually important.

It is from the pen of one who is well fitted to deal with the subject by nature, grace and learning.

It is the work of one of the most valued contributors to the *Quarterly*, and we venture to say one of the best known. Everything that Father Coupe does is done admirably. This work has upon it the stamp of the student and the thinker.

It is an additional pleasure to open a book when the author is known to you and you have confidence in him. In the present instance the confidence is not misplaced. The book is very full, or rather we should say very complete, very clear and very convincing. It may be placed in the hands of an intelligent non-Catholic without comment or explanation, and it will convince him in regard to one of the most difficult dogmas of the Church. It may be used by a priest who is instructing converts without any variation or amplification. We think it worth while to quote at length from the introduction and to print the titles of chapters or lectures.

The following set of sixteen lectures on the Holy Eucharist I have, with the author's leave, disentombed from various sources—English, Irish and American—in which the course, or parts of it, had originally appeared.

Many reporter's errors and hundreds of printer's blunders I have corrected. I have also eliminated all such repetitions as must

of necessity occur in verbatim reports of lectures which the speaker intended for the ear and not for the eye, for the hearer rather than for the reader.

For the notes and references I alone am responsible.

These, be it said, are essentially popular lectures. Consequently, the more recondite aspects of the profound subject, set forth with such lucidity, are but slightly touched on.

Moreover, the lectures, when delivered, were limited to time, and, therefore, make no claim to be exhaustive. Nor, as the speaker's object was exposition and not controversy, does he directly and formally attempt to confute the usual host of Protestant objections, though to a thoughtful mind the exposition itself will easily suggest satisfactory answers.

The appearance of these lectures in book form will, I hope, prove acceptable to the public at large. Those especially who listened to them at the time of their delivery—whether in the North or in the South, for they have been often repeated—and who can remember the interest they excited, and the favor with which they were received, will doubtless be glad to have them in this permanent form, and will find the private perusal of only less utility than was the public hearing of them.

Our Holy Father has insisted much of late on the obvious, but too much neglected, duty of Christians to make better acquaintance with the essential dogmas of the Faith. A little volume like the present makes it possible for the busiest and least instructed to gain clear ideas concerning this vital mystery of religion—the Blessed Sacrament of the altar. Nor will the professional student find that the lecturer has failed to provide him—without, at the same time mystifying readers of the more popular type—with ample matter for reflection.

Thus to crystallize into popular form Catholic doctrine—philosophy, dogma and theology—concerning the Holy Eucharist, in these days when this mystery of religion is by the erudite and by the man in the street so largely misunderstood, and so widely misrepresented, is certainly a boon. These lectures, unmarred by a single unkind word about opponents, march uncompromisingly to the fulfillment, from promise to performance, from doctrine to dogma, from dogma to devotion. For from the mists of ancient prophecy they manuduct us into the full light of Christian fulfillment; from the red altar-stone of the typical Jewish sacrifice they lead us to the foot of the bloodless altar of the Immolated God, to that Emmanuel in Whom the types of old find their verification.

CONTENTS.

Lecture	I.	The Old Testament Prophecies of the Mass.
Lecture	II.	Christ's Promise of the Eucharist, I.
Lecture	III.	Christ's Promise of the Eucharist, II.
Lecture	IV.	Christ's Institution of the Eucharist, I.
Lecture	V.	Christ's Institution of the Eucharist, II.
Lecture	VI.	St. Paul's Testimony: The Eucharist as an Institution in the Early Church.
Lecture	VII.	Transubstantiation.
Lecture	VIII.	What Transubstantiation Is.

- Lecture IX. Leibnitz on the Eucharist.
 Lecture X. Testimonies of the Liturgies.
 Lecture XI. Testimony of the Early Fathers to the Real Presence.
 Lecture XII. Testimonies of the Early Fathers to Transubstantiation.
 Lecture XIII. The Early Fathers on the Eucharist.
 Lecture XIV. Corpus Christi.
 Lecture XV. The Sacrament of Love.
 Lecture XVI. The Four Manifestations of God in Man.
-

LECTURES, CONTROVERSIAL AND DEVOTIONAL. By *Father Malachy, C. P.*
 First Edition. 16mo., pp. 218. M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin; Benziger
 Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

These lectures are right in line with the work of those who are engaged in giving missions to non-Catholics in this country at the present time, and they could be used in their entirety by any preacher or lecturer addressing a non-Catholic or mixed congregation. If they are somewhat more rigorous than our needs demand, it is because greater vigor was required in Protestant Belfast, where they were originally delivered. But they lose nothing by that, and we prefer rather too much heat in matters of this kind than too little.

The author's statement of his purpose is interesting, and the index will serve as a guide to the engineer.

"In the discharge of my priestly duties I have from time to time delivered in our Church of Holy Cross, Belfast, short courses of controversial and devotional lectures. They were, as a rule, hastily prepared, and my aim was to adapt them to the necessities of time and place, and treat the subjects in such a simple manner as to be easily intelligible to the most unskillful minds.

"Any one acquainted with the social conditions under which our Catholic people live in this city will readily understand that religious controversies are forced upon them with persistence in every walk of life. Almost every subject—social, commercial, political and industrial—is looked at from a sectarian standpoint; and, as a consequence, religion is dragged into all the ordinary details of life.

"Every fair-minded person will be obliged to admit that Catholics are not the aggressors in this polemical arena. The discussion of religious topics, of a controversial nature, in public works and at street corners is more likely to engender bitterness than to promote the real interests of religion. And, knowing this unfortunate tendency, Catholics, as a rule, abstain from introducing these debatable questions, not from any conviction of the weakness of their cause, but from a desire of avoiding discussions which have usually no other effect than to provoke excitement and mutual recriminations.

"But it is hard to remain silent under provocation, especially when a person is passionately devoted to his religious beliefs. Moreover, in such circumstances, however distasteful the task may be, it becomes a duty for priests, at least occasionally, to deal with those debatable questions and expose the calumnies and fallacies

invented by the enemies of the Church in order to undermine the loyalty of Catholics.

"It was a sense of this obligation that induced me to deliver the controversial portion of these lectures. There was no desire of attacking Protestants when the lectures were delivered, and there is none now. In as moderate language as the subject would admit of, the popular objections of Protestantism were stated and answered, mainly with a view of placing concisely before Catholics information which their busy lives made it impossible for them to obtain."

INDEX.

- I. On the Necessity of Belonging to the True Church.
- II. Whether Protestantism as Defined by Herself be the True Church?
- III. Whether the Effects of Protestantism Proclaim Her to be the True Church?
- IV. Whether There Be upon Earth an Infallible Guide to Heaven?
- V. Credentials of the Catholic Church.
- LECTURES ON CATHOLIC BELIEF.
- VI. The Supremacy of the Pope.
- VII. The Infallibility of the Pope.
- VIII. "The Worship of the Virgin."
- IX. The Holy Eucharist.
- X. The Sacrifice of the New Law.
- XI. Christian Marriage.
- XII. The Modern Heresy.
- LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR.
- XIII. Jesus, Our Model.
- XIV. His Love.
- XV. His Zeal.
- XVI. His Gentleness.

A MANUAL OF BIBLE HISTORY. I. The Old Testament. By *Charles Hart, B. A.*, Assistant Master at St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-the-Tyne, author of "The Intermediate English Grammar. 12mo., pp. 623, with maps. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

The main object aimed at in compiling this work has been to supply a want much felt in Catholic secondary schools and colleges, for a text-book of Scripture history which may serve not only for class and examination purposes, but as an introduction to the study of the Bible. That the student may from the very commencement of his studies be made familiar with Scripture phraseology the exact words of the Sacred Text, whenever suitable, have been so interwoven with the narrative that the simple grandeur of the many sublime Bible stories have, as far as possible, been preserved. How far this aim has been secured may be gathered from the words of the Rev. Dr. Wheatley, Professor of Scripture at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, and official censor of this work, who writes: "What delights me most of all is the way in which you have worked

so much of the Sacred Text into your narrative. I think it such an advantage that we should become as familiar as possible, even from our youngest years, with every word of inspired writings; and as we cannot put Bibles into the hands of young people, such a book as the one you have written will prove of the greatest advantage.

"From long experience gained in teaching Bible History, the author has always found that it has been well-nigh a hopeless task for the student to secure from the text-books in general use a clear grasp of the historical facts connected with the separate kingdoms of Juda and Israel, as they overlap to such a degree as to render the difficulty perplexing. To make this part of the work more simple and clear, the affairs of the rival kingdoms have been arranged, as far as possible, in alternate chapters, so that contemporary events will be found to run parallel; and thus the student while engaged in one particular kingdom, will have knowledge of what was at the same time being enacted in the other. As it is intended that the work may serve as a useful aid to the study of the Bible, specially printed maps have been added, with the names according to the Vulgate spelling, and a classification of all books of the Old Testament, together with a summary of the non-historical books, has been given in an appendix. Moreover, that the reader may understand the significance of our Lord's word 'All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the Psalms concerning Me' (Luke xxiv, 44), the chief Messianic prophecies appearing in the Psalms and in the Prophets will be found added to the outline of the respective Books.

"In another appendix is given a short account of the language of the Old Testament, and of the connection of the dialects spoken in Palestine at the time of our Lord with those of the surrounding peoples. In this appendix, too, it has been thought well to insert a brief history of some of the principal versions of the Sacred Scriptures.

"On account of the frequent mention in the Bible of the Jews falling into idolatry previous to the time of the Babylonian captivity—but never after their return—a fourth appendix will be found telling of the nature of the false gods they worshiped, and with what deities in Greek and Roman mythology these strange gods are said to have been identified.

"The great body of the work itself has been compiled chiefly from the text and notes of Haydock's Douai Bible; but for the part between the two Testaments—that is, from the end of the Books of the Maccabees—the Jewish historian Josephus is the one authority."

The book is splendidly made as to paper, type and arrangement. The marginal index adds much to its value, and the maps are clear and accurate.

SISTER MARY OF THE DIVINE HEART. Droste zu Vischering. Religious of the Good Shepherd, 1863-1899. By the *Abbé Louis Chasle*. Translated from the second French edition by a member of the order. 12mo., pp. 433. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

It is remarkable that the life of a religious who died at the early age of thirty-six years, in 1899, should have been published

three times already. And yet this is what has happened in the case of Sister Mary of the Divine Heart. If the lives of canonized saints edify us and spur us on to better things, the lives of uncanonized servants of God should help us still more, because they seem to be nearer to us and more easy of imitation.

The present record of early sanctity is very edifying, and those who are seeking God will find the way clearer if they follow the light of the lamp of this wise virgin, which was always trimmed, filled and burning. She hath entered in the Bridegroom—who can doubt it who follows the record. To religious it presents a special attraction.

The following sketch is interesting:

"On Tuesday, June 8, 1899, at three o'clock in the afternoon, in a very poor cell of a convent in Oporto, Portugal, a woman, still young in age—for she counted but thirty-six years—lay on her deathbed. This religious, who belonged to the noble Westphalian family of the Counts Droste zu Vischering, had, when she joined the Order of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers, changed her illustrious family name for that of Sister Mary of the Divine Heart. At the same hour, and simultaneously with the first Vespers of the Feast of the Heart of Jesus, were inaugurated the opening solemnities prescribed by Leo XIII. for the Consecration of the whole human race to the Sacred Heart.

"Both within and without the convent the most touching marks of appreciation were called forth by the death of her who was named, 'the holy Superior.' As a poor religious she should have been carried to the grave, as are the poor whom she loved so well; but as soon as the enclosure-door was thrown open six representatives of noble families took possession of her coffin and bore it to the grave on their shoulders. Such a sight had never been witnessed before in the streets of Oporto. Contrary to the usual custom and notwithstanding the extreme heat, ladies followed the coffin until it reached the cemetery, a distance of half a league. The reputation for sanctity which was thus so strongly manifested has outlived those first impressions and has spread throughout the whole world, founded as it is on the virtues which shone forth in the life of this religious; on her joyful patience in the sufferings of a prolonged illness, on her ardent and indefatigable zeal for the salvation of souls, and, in fine, on her devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

"This holy sister, who died on the very Eve of the Consecration of the human race to the Sacred Heart, had been entrusted by our Lord Himself with His wishes relating to this great act, in the accomplishment of which she had so large a share, and to which we may attribute as a fitting preparation the marvels He worked in her soul during the many preceding years.

"Her whole life was but one long ascent towards her Divine Master, who drew her to Himself, at first by ordinary inspirations of grace, but from the time she attained her twenty-first year, by most intimate communications which tended to form in her soul a strong spirit of self-sacrifice and to constitute her a victim of love, reparation and propitiation; in fact, a victim ever ready to suffer

all things which might further the reign of the Sacred Heart throughout the whole universe."

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY FOR THE LAITY. Being a brief, clear and systematic exposition of the reason and authority of religion, and a practical guide-book for all of good-will. By *Rev. P. Geiermann, C. SS. R.* With an introduction by the *Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D. D.*, Archbishop of St. Louis. 16mo., pp. 408. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

"The competition of daily life prevents many honest persons from devoting that time and attention to the subject of religion which it deserves. In consequence of this lamentable fact there are persons to-day who profess no religion, because they have no clear idea of its nature or of its necessity for human happiness. Others do not profess the true religion because they do not understand the reason and authority of its claims. Some, no doubt, profess the true religion, but do not practice it as they ought because they fail to appreciate its excellence. They regard it more as a burden than as a natural debt which man owes to the God of infinite goodness. Instead of regarding religion as the only source of true happiness, they often shun it as something disagreeable. Hence they are unhappy even when surrounded with heavenly blessings, for their conscience is ill at ease. Knowledge can show men the way to happiness, but these persons scarcely have time to pause and listen to its counsel. This 'Theology for the Laity' is especially intended to enlighten and encourage 'all of good will' who are handicapped in this way. It shows them the nature, the necessity, the certainty, the beauty and the harmony of divine religion as the masterpiece of the God of Goodness. It is a complete religious hand-book for busy people, especially for members of the true fold. Persons of leisure may find more profitable reading in the many excellent doctrinal and polemic works that have appeared in recent years. Still a brief, clear and systematic manual of theology for the laity has advantages of its own. It is calculated to interest even those who will not study larger and more learned works. It will often be taken up by those whose limited time will not permit more extensive reading. Its simple, direct method ought to recommend it, in a particular manner, to the honest inquirer, for it gives him a clear and comprehensive idea of that religion which alone spans the chasm between the natural and the supernatural. For this reason 'Theology for the Laity' may also be of special service to many pastors whose time for instructing converts is limited by other parochial work."

A complete course of theology in so concise a form was badly needed. Such a book is the best manual of instruction for Catholics and Protestants, because it covers the whole field. The greatest danger in making it is the danger of obscurity which threatens most when extreme conciseness is sought, especially when working in scientific fields. The book has been highly praised and warmly recommended.

"Theology for the Laity" is offered as an intelligent and practical guide to all honest souls on their pilgrimage to heaven. Its

object is to give a concise yet systematic exposition of "The Reason and Authority of Religion."

The plan which it observes is (1) to investigate the Fundamental Ideas of Religion as proposed by Reason and History; (2) to study Revealed Religion, both in its Supernatural Truths and in its Divinely Ordained Practice; (3) to show how the True Religion of To-day logically follows from these two premises.

In composing this guide book the author has naturally availed himself of the privileges of a guide: (1) to point out things of interest; (2) to explain them in his own way; (3) to give his reasons for the same. Before proceeding from one object of interest to another, the author has tried to anticipate and briefly answer those objections and questions which the heavenly pilgrim might wish to have explained if the author were actually with him as his guide.

There can be no question about the value of a book of this kind.

OUTLINES OF SERMONS FOR YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN. By the *Rev. Joseph Schuen*. Edited by the *Rev. Edmund J. Wirth, Ph. D.* 12mo., pp. 451. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

Father Augustine Scherer, the author of a series of excellent volumes of aid and counsel for preachers, writes thus concerning leagues and sodalities: "These associations for Christians of different callings and states of life are to be counted among the fairest blossoms that mark the development of the Church's vitality. They well deserve to be introduced into every congregation and carefully fostered, since their aim is to promote true Christian principles and a Christian manner of life, and zealously to guard the faithful from the contamination of that moral corruption now invading every rank of society. Their object is also to further the conscientious fulfillment of the duties peculiar to each state of life, and the avoidance of the several dangers appertaining to each, besides giving greater force and efficacy to performance of religious exercises and good works by the united action of the members.

"The associations here spoken of are, in fact, a source of abundant blessing; they are admirably calculated to maintain and propagate morality and Godliness in Christian communities. But if they are to live and flourish amongst us and exercise a permanent influence for good, it is indispensably necessary to deliver an instruction of the subject at short intervals. In most places where such confraternities are organized a conference is given at certain intervals, either in public, or, which is far more preferable, at a meeting from which non-associates are excluded. I have frequently heard the wish expressed for some manual that would assist the preacher in addressing these different sodalities. In truth, there is a lack of books, for this most important branch of Catholic Homiletics has been comparatively neglected; I have been unable to meet with any books on this particular subject, except an occasional homily in a volume of sermons. Accordingly I set to work to collect building materials for the use of directors of these associations; I say build-

ing materials advisedly, for the kind reader will not find a finished edifice, complete discourses, in these pages, but simple sketches or outlines prepared for him to work on. My reasons for choosing to provide the latter rather than the former was in order, on the one hand, to supply as large an amount of material as possible, and on the other, to leave the work of filling in details to the preacher who makes use of this book.

"Every one who considers the matter attentively will readily perceive that my task was by no means a light one, as it was necessary to confine myself in treating each subject to a narrow compass if my design was to be carried out. I was, besides, compelled to leave the beaten track, which is smooth and easy to the wayfarer, and to mark out a new path across a country where only rarely do the footsteps of preceding travelers indicate the right direction to be taken. I must, therefore, beg the kind reader to be lenient in his judgment of the deficiencies of this book. It would afford me heartfelt pleasure should any one, advancing further on the track that I have cleared, produce a really excellent and useful work."

This statement is so clear that it calls for no comment. We do not know what experience the author has had which might fit him for work of this kind, nor do we know what the editor did.

A NEW SCHOOL OF GREGORIAN CHANT. By the *Rev. Dom. Dominic Johner, O. S. B.*, of Beuron Abbey. From the German. Cum Permissu Superiorum. 12mo., pp. 296. Fr. Pustet, Ratisbon, Rome, New York and Cincinnati.

Gregorian chant is probably attracting more attention than ever before. Heretofore it was almost unknown in this country except in ecclesiastical seminaries, but since the Holy Father's Encyclical on church music it has attracted the attention of the whole musical world. The literature of the subject has naturally grown very rapidly; indeed, so very rapidly as to be almost bewildering. Choirmasters and organists and singers who are anxious to follow the requirements of the Encyclical seem to be hindered rather than helped by this abundant literature, because, unfortunately, there are certain points about which the doctors disagree, and in the meantime the patient suffers.

It is a pity that we could not have something definite and authoritative on the subject from the first, or that the subject was not kept from us until we could have it in a definite and authoritative form. But that is an abstract discussion which has no place at the present time.

We find the "New School of Gregorian Chant" before us. We should like to tell our readers that it is the best book of its kind, but we are not competent to judge. Who is, since the doctors disagree? We studied Gregorian chant for several years during our seminary course, and sang it and fancied we knew something about it. We are beginning to think we were mistaken, and we have reached that stage where we are free to confess our fear to express an opinion. Therefore we shall quote from the author himself as to his purpose and plan.

"This 'New School of Gregorian Chant' is intended for practical purposes in the wide domain of ecclesiastical music, and by no means as an academy for savants and professional musicians. Indeed, it is one of its most important and congenial tasks to elevate to a higher level those whose capacities are inconsiderable or but moderate, and to enable them to render Gregorian chants in a worthy manner and, so far as possible, in a really artistic style; more especially, however, to train them for their highly important duties in connection with the liturgy, and so to enkindle their enthusiasm for it. Although in practice we have usually to deal with persons who possess little or no ability, yet it was necessary to consider those who are more advanced and capable of being developed, and at least to point out to such the path leading to excellence, so that, if God has bestowed upon them the talent and the will, they may do their best to follow it. For though Gregorian sung in a simple and devotional manner, let us say, by little children, may greatly please us, still its full beauty and the perfection of its varied forms can only be displayed when it is treated as artistic music.

"Choir-singers are seldom good singers; that is to say, they do not often possess the knowledge and practical experience indispensable for the methodical use of the human voice. This is probably the main reason why the results of strenuous efforts are at times so unsatisfactory and why we have to complain of the manifold difficulties connected with the cultivation of plain chant and church music generally.

"The author of the New School is of opinion that the theory of equal measure for the plain chant notes, using this term in its accepted sense as equivalent to time value, is not only the one that can be best defended from an historical point of view, but he also recognizes in this interpretation the only possible method of rendering these expressive chants in a natural and logical manner, satisfying all the requirements of art, and in accordance with the convictions of those who have formed correct opinions on the subject."

MANUAL OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY. A Practical Guide for Ecclesiastical Students and Newly Ordained Priests. By *Rev. Frederick Schulze*, Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at the Provincial Seminary of St. Francis. 8vo., pp. 462. The M. H. Wiltzius Company, Milwaukee,

Wis.

It must be admitted that no text-book can excel in volume for the young priest, other things being equal, the book which contains the lectures of his seminary professor. It places in his hands in permanent form the lessons which he learned when preparing for the ministry and which he is expected to put into practice afterwards. With this book in hand, he can consult his teacher at any moment and receive direction from him in the old familiar form which he knows so well and which has become so familiar as to be easy. If he go to a strange author, he must become accustomed to his style and language, and this requires time.

For this reason the alumni of an institution ought to give an unusually warm welcome to a former professor's book.

But others should welcome it also, because the fact that the writer has taught the subject and writes from experience an *a priori* argument in his favor. When to experience we add knowledge, we have a happy combination.

Here is a word from the author in his own defense :

"Pastoral theology has at last appeared on the programmes of our ecclesiastical seminaries as a special branch of sacred science, filling thereby a long-felt want. The newly-ordained priest needs a guide to steer him safely past the rocks and shoals which lie in his course when he launches into the open sea of practical ministry and apostolic labor. And this applies particularly to our own country, for here a priest's pastoral duties extend over a vastly wider sphere than elsewhere, and we have none of the traditional usages and laws with which clerical life is wont to be regulated abroad. Too often, almost immediately after his ordination, the young priest is sent to a mission where he is entirely alone. Comparatively few young ecclesiastics are fortunate enough to remain as assistants to experienced pastors for a sufficient length of time, under whom, by a wise supervision, they are gradually introduced to parochial work. Under these circumstances it is but proper that the advanced classes of our ecclesiastical students be given a course of lectures on Pastoral Theology before they leave the seminary.

"A course on Pastoral Theology was commenced in the Seminary of St. Francis several years ago. However, the need of a suitable text-book was keenly felt. None being available in English, and those in other languages not being adapted to this country, we determined to prepare a text-book to meet the existing want.

"Since this work was begun a praiseworthy volume on this topic has been prepared by Rev. Dr. Stang; but we believe that there is ample room for another. We therefore present this volume in the hope that it may prove of practical value.

"The plan followed in the voluminous works on Pastoral Theology by such eminent authors as Berger, Schuech and others has been adopted, the subject matter being divided into three sections, treating of the Sacraments, on Preaching and the Government of Parishes. Deeming the Sacraments to be the most important part and deserving of lengthy explanation, it has been placed first."

THE GLORIES OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. How it is and ought to be venerated and adored. Instructions and exhortations taken from or composed in the spirit of the writings of Blessed Margaret Mary, together with an enumeration of the various devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. From the original of *Rev. M. Hausherr, S. J.* With preface by *Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J.* 16mo., pp. 544. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

A new book on Devotion to the Sacred Heart. Many persons will ask why? Have we not enough already? Yes and no. We have enough if they were sufficiently widely known and zealously used, because there are no new revelations. No, because ascetically speaking, the subject is exhaustless, and because all men have not yet been drawn as near to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and they

never will be in the present life. Therefore, anything, be it word, act, picture, book or person, which can draw even one human heart by the smallest fraction of an inch nearer to the Divine Heart is worth while.

Father Wynne tells us that this book can do that and more. His testimony is sufficient. Here it is.

"As deeds more than words are proof of love, it is quite proper that a book treating of a devotion which is preëminently one of love should insist not only on the study of the nature and object of the devotion, but also, and chiefly, on the practices by which it is cultivated and the fruits by which it is best appreciated. Notable for this very reason among the thousands of books which have been written about the most widely-practiced devotion of our day is Father Hausherr's 'Glories of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.' The extraordinary variety of its contents would at first sight seem bewildering, but they are so clearly divided and so well ordered that each part can be used without reference to the others, or in such a manner as to throw light on them. Based on the writings of Blessed Margaret Mary, and composed entirely in her spirit, the book contains more of what she did than of what she said by way of devotion to the Sacred Heart. It is thus a convincing answer for those who believe that this devotion savors too much of sentimentality or too little of earnest piety; to others who complain of the tendency to invent new practices of piety and prayers it will be welcome as illustrating how this devotion inspires one to use the prayers of the Church with quickened intelligence and fervor.

PRAXIS SOLEMNIUM FUNCTIONUM EPISCOPORUM. Cum Appendicibus pro Abbatibus Mitratis et Pronotariis Apostolicis, iuxta Ritum Romanum. Studio et Opere Sac. *Beniamini Favrin*, in Seminario Ep. Tarvisino Rectoris Vice Fungentis. 8vo., pp. 144. Neo-Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet.

The author's former work, "Parvum Cæremoniale pro Pronotariis apost. ad instar particip," was so well received and highly commended that the author was constrained to yield to the popular demand which was promptly made for a similar work on Episcopal functions. The author's special fitness for this kind of work was at once apparent, and it is not a common kind of ability. Any one who has assisted at Episcopal functions knows how difficult it is to prepare himself, not because it is hard to read the ceremonial and understand it, but because so many persons are concerned that it is not easy to fit in with the others in such a manner as to bring about unity and harmony. This is, most of all, due to the fact that the ordinary ceremonial describes the duties of each officer in order, but not in such a way as to show his relations to the other officers at each moment. And yet this is what is really necessary if we are to have order. This is what Father Favrin has done. In his book, in parallel columns running each two pages, he describes the duties of all those who take part in Episcopal functions, beginning with the bishop and ending with the minor ministers. He frequently illustrates the text with diagrams. It is all very brief, very simple

and very clear. It is the ideal way of teaching ceremonial. At a glance each person taking part in the function can tell what he should do and where he should be at each moment, and he can also tell what all the others should do and where they should be. If all the ministers of Episcopal functions use this book, the Church ceremonial will really instruct and edify.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS a Joanne Petro Gury, S. J., Conscriptum et ab Antonio Ballerini, eiusdem Societatis, adnotationibus auctum, deinde vero ad breviorē formam exaratum, atque ad Usū Seminariū huius Regionis accommodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S. J. Editio decima septima recognita a Timotheo Barrett, S. J. Fr. Pustet & Co., Neo-Eboraci, 1906.

A new edition of Father Sabetti's Moral Theology brings before us again all its excellencies, and emphasizes the fact that it is the most popular manual of the day. Father Sabetti's popularity is very well explained by these words of Father Barrett in the preface to the sixteenth edition:

"Love and reverence forbid us to allow this occasion to pass without expressing our gratitude to Father Sabetti, who for the twenty-five years immediately preceding his death taught moral theology in Woodstock College. The wonderful prudence of this man in solving cases, his profound knowledge of moral theology, his bright charity held us all, pupils, brothers in religion and friends, bound to him in life, and our love follows him in death." All the qualities which distinguished Father Sabetti as a teacher and director are evident in his book, and account for its well-deserved popularity. We think that we have remarked before how satisfying the book is in practice. Nine times out of ten, and probably much more frequently, it will answer the questions of morals which come before us. One might safely say to the seminarian, to the newly ordained priest and to the man seasoned in the ministry, begin with Sabetti, continue with Sabetti, end with Sabetti, and you will never go astray.

MEDICINA PASTORALIS IN USUM CONFESSARIORUM ET ECCLESIASTICARUM. Accedunt "Tabulæ Anatomicæ" Explicativæ. Auctore Joseph Antonelli, Sacerdote, Naturalium Scientiarum Doctore ac Professore. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 458. Tabulæ Anatomicæ, 8vo., pp. 71. Fredericus Pustet, Neo-Eboraci.

Works on Pastoral Medicine have increased in number during the last year. This is the fourth we have had before us for review. They differ very much in scope and treatment, although one might expect that in scope at least they would all be alike. If, however, we give more thought to the subject we shall realize that such is not the case. The general plan on which all such works must be built is to unite medicine and theology in such a way as to enable the physician and the priest to meet and coöperate with each other in the practice of the two sciences. In other words, to give to the

priest the medicine of theology and to the physician the theology of medicine. To unite such a work is a task that should not be undertaken lightly, for it requires full, accurate knowledge of both sciences and a delicacy of treatment which few writers in this field possess. Hence we have seen treatises on Pastoral Medicine which were almost useless because of their perfunctory character, being little more than brief, colorless compilations.

The book before us is a rare exception. It is full and scientific. It is written by one who is a master in this field, and it will undoubtedly be the standard work on the subject.

Its exhaustiveness may be judged from its size; the first volume is an octavo book of 458 pages. Probably the second volume will be as large. All who want a complete theological library must have it.

SNOW-BOUND. A Winter Idyl. By *John Greenleaf Whittier*. With twenty full-page illustrations. Drawings by Howard Pyle, John J. Enniking and Edward H. Garrett. Decorations by Adrian J. Jorio. 8vo., pp. 96. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

From its first appearance, "Snow-Bound" has been one of the most popular of American poems, and, indeed, of all poems of nature. It has been issued in many forms, and the combined demand for copies with adequate illustrations has led the publishers to prepare the present edition. They count themselves fortunate in being able to avail themselves of the work of John J. Enniking, long recognized as one of our best landscape painters, of book-illustrators like Howard Pyle and E. H. Garrett; of Herbert W. Gleason, whose photographs from nature are unsurpassed in artistic excellence, and of Adrian J. Jorio, who has specially designed the cover and the many decorations in the volume. It may easily be imagined that the result of such a combination is a very beautiful book, and seasonable, too, for we are just about to enter into the snow-bound season. This volume should be much in demand about Christmas tide, for it is especially adapted to holiday purposes.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE MADONNA OF THE POETS.** This is That Blessed Mary Pre-Elect God's Virgin. By *Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Burns & Oates, 28 Orchard street, London, W. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.
- THE LESSONS OF THE KING.** Made plain for His little ones by a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.
- THE RELIGION OF OUR FOREFATHERS.** By the *Rev. Vincent Hornyold, S. J.* Burns & Oates, 28 Orchard street, London, W.
- THE BLESSED JOHN VIANNEY,** Cure D'Ars, Patron of Parish Priests. By *Joseph Vianney*. Translated by C. W. W. Duckworth & Co., 3 Henrietta street, London, W. C. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.
- CYPRIAN, THE CHURCHMAN.** By *John Alfred Faulkner*, Professor of Historical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati. Eaton & Mains, New York.
- BRIEFS FOR OUR TIMES.** By *Rev. Morgan M. Sheedy*, rector of St. John's Church, Altoona, Pa., author of "Christian Unity," "Social Problems," etc. Thomas Whittaker, New York.
- THE SOGGARTH AROON.** By *Rev. Joseph Guinan, C. C.*, author of "Priest and People in Doon." Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.
- THE MOTHER OF JESUS: In the First Age and After.** By *J. Herbert Williams*. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.
- ECCLESIASTES IN THE METRE OF OMAR.** With an introductory essay on Ecclesiastes and the Rubaiyat. By *William Byron Forbush*. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge.
- TALKS WITH THE LITTLE ONES: About the Apostles' Creed.** By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.
- COMMENTARY ON THE CATECHISM OF REV. W. FAERBER,** for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States. Edited by *Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C. SS. R.* B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., and Freiburg. Price, net, \$1.75.
- PROBABILISMUS VINDICATUS** ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J., cum approbatione Rev. Archiep. Friburg et Super. Ordinis. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., and Freiburg. Price, net, 75c.
- DIE BRIEFE DES HEILIGEN JOHANNES** uebersetzt und erklart von *Dr. Johannes Evangelist Belser*, mit approbation des Hochw. Herrn Erzbischofs von Freiburg. B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, net, \$1.10.
- JUSTINS DES MAERTYRERS LEHRE VON JESUS CHRISTUS,** dem Messias und dem menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie von *Alfred Leonhard Feder, S. J.* B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, net, \$2.60.
- THE HUMANIZING OF THE BRUTE,** or the Essential Difference Between the Human and Animal Soul Proved From Their Specific Activities. By *H. Muckermann, S. J.* With five plates. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., and Freiburg. Price, net, 75c.
- DEATH, REAL AND APPARENT,** in Relation to the Sacraments. A physiologico-theological study by *Rev. Juan B. Ferreres, S. J.* B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., and Freiburg. Price, net, 75c.

70764

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL

